# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 029 926 UD 005 155

By-Kravetz, Nathan

A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas. Evaluation of New York City Title I Educational Projects 1966-67.

Center for Urban Education, New York, N.Y. Committee on Field Research and Evaluation.

Spons Agency-New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y.

Pub Date Sep 67

Note-116p.

EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.90

Descriptors-Academic Achievement, Administrator Attitudes, *Community Change, Community Involvement, Counseling, *Elementary Schools, *Enrichment Programs, Ethnic Distribution, Individual Instruction, *Junior High Schools, Program Development, *Program Evaluation, Questionnaires, Remedial Reading, School Integration, School Libraries, Special Services, Staff Utilization, Statistical Data, Teacher Attitudes, Teaching Load

Identifiers-Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, New York City

To increase the stability of communities undergoing social and economic change, increased specialized services are offered to meet the individual needs of pupils. In 79 elementary and 37 junior high schools, teaching and nonteaching staff were added so that corrective reading, counseling, special classes, and reduced class size could be provided. Selected was a sample of 20 elementary schools where no other programs were operating and where ethnic groups included 35% or more "others". Questionnaires were sent to principals and teachers in these schools to discover types and uses of specialist services, changes in ethnic groupings, changes in pupil achievement, and opinions of the professional staff of the program. It is recommended that this program be continued in specifically defined elementary schools in transitional areas, with emphasis on personnel and remedial reading. Further emphasis should be placed on libraries, enrichment, and guidance activities. Administrative assignments should be limited to teacher training and support. Teachers and the community should be fully informed and involved in the planning of the program. For a history and description of ESEA Title I in New York City, 1965-1968, see UD 007 904. (AF)

ED029926

05155 E

EVALUATION OF NEW YORK CITY TITLE I
EDUCATIONAL PROJECTS 1966-67

# A SPECIAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM OF QUALITY INTEGRATED EDUCATION FOR SCHOOLS IN TRANSITIONAL AREAS

By Nathan Kravetz

September 1967

UD 005 155

**The Center For Urban Education**
**33 West 42nd St., New York, N.Y. 10036**

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Center for Urban Education
33 West 42nd Street
New York, New York 10036

# A SPECIAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM OF QUALITY INTEGRATED EDUCATION FOR SCHOOLS IN TRANSITIONAL AREAS

Nathan Kravetz

Evaluation of a New York City school district educational project funded under Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (PL 89-10), performed under contract with the Board of Education of the City of New York for the 1966-67 school year.

Committee on Field Research and Evaluation
Joseph Krevisky, Assistant Director

September 1967

UD 005 155

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

II Plan of the Study . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6

III Selection of Sample Schools . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 9

IV Additional Staff and Services . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 11

V Analysis of Additional Services in the Program . . . . . . . 17

VI Program Evaluation by Principals . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 24

VII Analysis of Teachers' Questionnaires . . . . . . . . . . . . 30

VIII Analysis of Reading Achievement Data . . . . . . . . . . . . 33

IX Analysis of Ethnic Data . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 55

X Summary and Recommendations . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 65

Appendix A: Tables . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . A1

Appendix B: Instruments . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . B1

Appendix C: Staff List . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . C1

# I INTRODUCTION

Current discussion among laymen and educators stresses continually the need for an integrated educational environment. Children tend to learn best when they are involved with different kinds of children: middle class and lower class; Negro, white, and Puerto Rican; English and non-English speaking, and so on. Such an environment reflects reality, permits the growth of individuals to their fullest potential, and encourages the positive self-image of those who have experienced failure, discouragement, and exclusion from economic and social progress.

If, to paraphase a recent court decision,[1] education is segregated, it cannot be equal, and if it is not equal, then its recipients suffer and are denied their rights.

What is expressed by social and educational researchers and by legal decisions is even more loudly stated by parents and community representatives: schools must be quality schools in integrated communities. This demand has been given full expression in the form of picket lines, boycotts, committee and community meetings, as well as through the formation of numerous action groups determined to confront the schools on the issue.

It is to these concerns that the New York City Board of Education attempted to address itself with the establishment in 1965-66 of "A Special Enrichment Program Geared to Excellence for Schools in Transitional Areas." In that program, evaluated in a report by Mrs. Barbara Heller,[2] the major objective was to "stem the tide of emigration of white middle-class families by providing schools with such superior services that one would be reluctant to move."

---

[1] "School Bias Decisions," New York Times, June 24, 1967.

[2] Center for Urban Education, August, 1966.

Program Description

For the school year 1966-67, the title is "A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas." The description is: "The communities concerned are in the process of social and economic transition. The accompanying changes create educational challenges for the schools in these areas. By increasing the specialized services in these schools, the individual needs of the pupils will be met, thus contributing to community stability. The schools in transition will provide quality integrated education through such measures as special enriched classes and after-school tutorial centers...."

In its provisions for achieving "quality integrated education," the program's principal features will include:

1. Class size - The placement of additional classroom teachers into these schools will reduce class size.
2. Corrective Reading Program - All children in need of this service will be exposed to special remedial reading and/or corrective reading. This will be accomplished by providing the schools with specialists in this area.
3. General Achievement - Instruction in art, health education, music, and science will be taken over by subject specialists who will coordinate their activities with those of the regular classroom teacher.
4. Counseling - Both individual and group counseling will be provided. In addition, special guidance classes will be set up for students in selected grades.

5. Library - Better equipped libraries will be provided in addition to more licensed library personnel.
6. After-School Study Centers - All pupils who are in need of additional help with school work will receive supervised remedial and tutorial help in special centers. These centers will be set up from 3:15 to 5:15 P.M. three days each week.
7. Special Classes - The increased school staff will facilitate special classes for both the gifted and slow in such areas as creative writing, art, music, and remedial reading.
8. At both the elementary and junior high school level additional teaching and nonteaching staff will be provided. These include additional administrators, supervisors, clerical staff, teachers to reduce class size, teacher specialists in corrective reading, library, art, health education, music, science, guidance.
9. Additional supplies will be provided. These include office equipment, books, instructional materials in the areas of reading, mathematics, art, music, and science.

A total of 460 positions and concomitant services were assigned to the elementary schools, and 324 to the junior high schools.

Total program budgets were: Elementary, $4,904,815; Junior High School, $2,791,233.

In brief, the project is aimed at promoting community stability, halting the departure of middle-class and/or white families by providing additional personnel and services. These, it is planned and expected, will effect a change in trends toward underachievement, will result in enhanced pupil achievement, and will provide those conditions in the schools that all parents want for their children and that all responsible citizens see as fundamental to quality education.

## Summary of Prior Study

At this point it is appropriate to establish the format and structure of this study, following closely as it does upon the evaluation by Mrs. Barbara Heller in August 1966. Mrs. Heller reported her conclusions (summarized by this writer) as follows:[3]

### Elementary Schools

1. On the average, each of the schools was assigned 5.63 additional positions.
2. Approximately 90 per cent of the positions assigned were filled.
3. Although, on the average, each school received about one additional classroom teacher assigned to reduce class size, there was little change in average class size in the elementary schools.
4. Principals reported that the additional positions permitted expansion of an enrichment of existing programs: music, remedial reading, art, science, and health education. They noted improvement of the overall school program with special mention of reading. They indicated improvement in guidance activities and increased identification of pupils with problems.
5. All school personnel reported improvement in pupil behavior and attitudes, work and study habits, and achievement.
6. School personnel noted least change in school attendance.

---

[3] Ibid.

7. According to reports of principals and other school personnel, the area of greatest improvement in pupil achievement was reading. There was no improvement in reading as measured by standardized reading achievement tests.
8. There was a tendency toward agreement among principals that teacher morale improved as a result of the program.
9. Most of the principals indicated a positive but vague improvement in the attitudes of parents toward the school.

Junior High Schools

1. Each school was assigned an average of 7.57 additional positions.
2. Approximately 83 per cent of the positions were filled.
3. Junior high school principals were less enthusiastic than elementary school principals about this program. They showed concern for the basis of assignments and considered themselves best qualified to decide which personnel were needed and how they were to be used.
4. Principals reported that the additional positions more often permitted the expansion of existing programs rather than the initiation of new ones. Such programs were mainly in remedial reading, library, and guidance.
5. A majority of the principals and other personnel reported slight improvement in pupil attitudes and behavior.
6. A small improvement was noted in the average per cent of attendance during the program year.

7. Although a number of principals anticipated improved reading achievement, standardized test results toward the end of the program year showed no improvement in reading achievement.
8. Average class size was reduced in grades seven, eight, and nine, by approximately one pupil.
9. Most of the principals agreed that teacher morale improved as a result of the extra services and reduced class size.
10. The effect of the program on parental attitudes could not be specifically determined.

Among her final comments, Mrs. Heller states:

> "Although the more positive aspects of the program as noted by the teachers and principals of the school...were not supported by the data, it does not necessarily follow that the transitional program was not effective. The data are interim in nature; for example, without the school-by-school results of the October 31, 1966 ethnic census data, the effects of the program on the primary goal, 'stemming the white middle class exodus,' cannot be estimated."[4]

## II PLAN OF THE STUDY

In this evaluation, the statements of the Board of Education regarding the need for a program in the transitional areas were accepted as cited above. It was then appropriate to select a sample of the schools in the program, to review the extent of the personnel and services components, and, if possible, to determine the effectiveness of those components in accomplishing the kind of educational changes which meet the needs of the transitional areas.

---

[4] Ibid.

We may, therefore, stipulate as follows:

1. The transitional areas program is intended to stem the tide of social and economic transition in specified communities.
2. The addition of personnel is planned to produce educational change, basically in terms of pupil achievement, which will be deemed satisfactory by parents.
3. The resultant modifications in school programs will reduce or inhibit the rate of transition in the communities concerned and preserve or increase their school integration status.

While the design and plan for this evaluation were developed by the writer, the continuing collaboration of Mrs. Barbara Heller was an important factor in the total project. Her specific contribution in the portion of the study relating to pupil achievement and her work on the questionnaires was invaluable. In addition, she provided important comments and suggestions on the project.

All information for this evaluation of the transitional schools program was made available to the Center for Urban Education by the New York City Board of Education. The preparation of the questionnaires was a joint project of Mrs. Barbara Heller and the writer. Special mention must be made of the support received from Mr. Joseph Krevisky and Mr. George Weinberg of the Center for Urban Education. The devoted assistance of Mrs. Julia Plapinger and Mrs. Frieda Kurash must also be acknowledged.

This evaluation has the following purposes:

1. to determine the number and kind of additional positions assigned under this program;
2. to determine the educational functions and services provided by these additional personnel;

3. to ascertain the effects, if any, upon the academic achievement of pupils in the schools;
4. to determine the effects, if any, of the assignment of these additional positions upon the movements of ethnic groups in the school communities.

A sample group of schools, 20 elementary and six junior high, was selected on the basis of criteria described below.

The following data were collected:

1. Principals' questionnaires. In February 1967, a questionnaire was sent to the principals asking for verification of additional positions assigned and filled, description of activities performed and at which grade levels, evaluation of additional services, parental attitudes, and general community conditions.
2. Teacher questionnaire. In April 1967, on the basis of principal reports, questionnaires were sent to teachers who had been in the transitional schools from 1963 or longer. Thus, it was assumed that teachers with four or more years of experience in a school could make evaluative comparisons of conditions before the start of the program and the present.
3. Ethnic data. The number and percentage of Negro, Puerto Rican, and other pupils on register as of October 31 of 1964, 1965, and 1966 were collected for the sample schools. These data are used to determine the effects, if any, of the transitional school program on its primary objective, contributing to community stability.

4. Reading achievement data. Selection was made of pupils tested in grades three through nine in April 1967 who had been enrolled and tested in prior years in the transitional schools. Achievement gains of the pupils who had experienced the effects, if any, of the transitional school program were reflected by comparison with anticipated achievement norms for the grade and with citywide results.

Data for pupils in the sample elementary schools were collected for reading achievement tests administered in April and October 1965, May and October 1966, and May 1967.

Data for junior high school pupils were collected for reading achievement tests administered in January and October 1965, June and October 1966, and April 1967.

## III SELECTION OF SAMPLE SCHOOLS

### Definition

At the initiation of this evaluation, ethnic distribution figures were available for the schools included under the rubric "Transitional Areas."

A factor which became apparent upon analysis of the schools and of their ethnic percentages was that a number of the transitional areas schools were also special service schools.

Special service schools are, in effect, schools in which the ratio of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils far exceeds that of Whites ("others"), so that the designation of "transitional" is hardly appropriate - the change has already taken place. Such schools also receive aid very similar to that in transitional schools. To attempt to evaluate a program which provides additional personnel and services (Transitional Areas Program) in schools where similar features exist (Special Service), would be difficult if not impossible.

In many instances, the ethnic distribution data showed that some schools enrolling fewer than 30 per cent "others" were designated as "transitional." Of the 16 Manhattan elementary schools, six were in this category in October 1965.

In the Bronx, four of the 19 schools enrolled fewer than 30 per cent "others." In Brooklyn, nine of the 20 schools, and in Queens, six of the 23 schools, showed fewer than 30 per cent "others" enrolled. (In the one elementary school in Richmond, designated as transitional, the "others" were over 70 per cent.)

One might question the designation as a transitional community of one in which the data indicate this type of ethnic distribution.

It was decided that for a feasible study of the transitional program, schools should be selected to make up a sample which did not include special service designation, and where the percentage of "others" enrolled would be in the range of 40 to 60 per cent. In the junior high schools, to meet these criteria, schools with the proportion of "others" at 73 per cent and 76 per cent were included in the sample.

It would be feasible to study those schools in which only the transitional areas program provided additional personnel and services, and whose community might be considered truly "transitional."

## Selection

For the 20 elementary schools and six junior high schools selected as the sample in terms of the criteria described above, see Tables Appendix $A^2$, and $A^3$.

## IV ADDITIONAL STAFF AND SERVICES

This program was focused upon increased staff and services; a questionnaire to principals provided data about this major aspect.

Questionnaires were devised in which principals might respond to various features and hoped-for activities. Of primary interest is the response concerning the assignment of personnel.

### Analysis of Additional Positions in Elementary Schools

Twenty questionnaires were sent to the elementary school principals; 18 were returned. Table 1 indicates the assignment of personnel "positions" and the filling of the positions, as well as other pertinent data, as reported in principals' questionnaires.

It should be stated that although personnel in the citywide transitional areas program included positions as Non-English teacher (NE), Reading Improvement teacher, Auxiliary teacher, and Citizenship Class teacher, none of these were in the sample schools. One might surmise that such personnel assignments were deemed more appropriate to the schools designated as special service, with higher percentages of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils.

We note that school secretary assignments rank third in this program after teachers to reduce class size and corrective reading teachers. This was the case not only for the sample schools but for all schools designated as transitional. In this category almost all assignments were full time and were occupied by individuals with the school secretary license. The median of years of experience as determined from 14 replies was 1.25 years.

The median years of experience for guidance counselors in the sample was two years as reported by five principals. Four of the nine guidance counselors in the sample had a license in that position; others had the common branches license.

## TABLE 1

## SAMPLE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL

| Personnel | Number Assigned | Number Filled | Median Years Experience |
|---|---|---|---|
| School secretary | 17.8 | 18.2* | 1.25 |
| Asst. to Principal | 2 | 1 | 0 |
| Guidance Counselor | 13.2 | 9 | 2 |
| Teachers: | | | |
| Librarian | 3 | 2 | not suitable |
| Reduce class size | 39 | 36 | 11 |
| OTP: | | | |
| Jr. Guidance | 4 | 2 | 7 |
| Correct. Reading | 18 | 18 | 20 |
| Health Education | 10 | 10 | 2 |
| Art | 7 | 6 | 6 |
| Music | 10 | 7.4 | 4.5 |
| Science | 12 | 10 | 12.5 |
| TOTALS | 136 | 119.6 | |

*As reported by Principals.

Of the two librarians, one had 35 years of teaching experience, and data for the second was not reported. Both held the common branches license.

Reports of experience in teaching were received for 18 of the schools where teachers were assigned to reduce class size. For this group the median experience was 11 years. Twenty-three of these teachers held common branches licenses; four held early childhood licenses.

The two junior guidance teachers were in the same school in the sample. They taught pupils in grades three and four and had 10 and 4 years of experience respectively.

Reports of 14 schools showed corrective reading teachers with a median of twenty years of teaching experience, three reporting 45, 32, and 30 years respectively. Corrective reading teachers all held common branches licenses and were generally teaching all grades, with the greatest frequency in grades two and three.

Health education teachers ranged in experience from 0 to 18 years, with a median of two years. Six had common branches licenses, two had junior high health education licenses, and one held a junior high social studies license. Three additional teachers taught in grades one through six.

Of the six art teachers in the sample, available data for three showed experience of 20, 6, and 0 years respectively. In two instances teachers assigned to music positions in the transitional areas program were used as art teachers on a part-time basis. They taught all grades.

Music teachers taught all grades, but were especially involved in organizing orchestras, instrument classes, and glee clubs. Four of these specialists were reported as having junior high school music licenses, the remainder common branches. Two teachers received to fill music positions were reported by their principals as assigned to art and remedial reading on a part-time basis.

Three of the eight science teachers reported by the principals had taught 36, 34, and 25 years respectively. Two of the science teachers were teaching remedial reading part time. Two were described by the principals as teaching for enrichment. All taught in grades one through six.

## Analysis of Additional Positions in Junior High Schools

In the junior high schools, the assignment of additional personnel in the sample schools is shown in Table 2. The data were derived from the returned questionnaires of the six junior high schools in the sample.

TABLE 2

SAMPLE JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS: ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL

| Personnel | Number Assigned | Number Filled | Median Years Experience |
|---|---|---|---|
| School secretary | 10 | 10 | 7.5 |
| Guidance Counselor | 5 | 5 | 5.5 |
| Demo. Teacher or Dept. Chairman | 2 | 2 | 4.0 |
| Lab. Assistant | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Teachers: | | | |
| Librarian | 5 | 5 | 6.0 |
| Corrective Reading | 3 | 3 | 2.5 |
| Career Guidance | 10 | 10 | 2.5 |
| Reduce class size | 14 | 7 | 2.0 |
| TOTALS | 51 | 44 | |

Four of the six junior high schools were assigned and received two additional secretaries; the remaining schools received one each. Principals indicated that the secretaries were involved in general office work, with two of the six respondents noting "pupil personnel" duties.

Five of the six schools in the junior high school sample received one additional guidance counselor each. The median experience was 5.5 years. Three held a guidance counselor's license, one social studies, and one common branches. Their work was primarily in grades seven and eight.

Two of the six schools received department chairmen, one with no experience, the other with eight years of experience. These figures may be misleading, since it is conceivable that the first individual's experience covered only service in this position and the second report was on total teaching experience.

Two schools in the sample received laboratory assistants, one with a substitute common branches license, both with less than one year's experience.

Five of the six schools received full-time librarians with a median experience of six years, ranging from two to 21 years.

One corrective reading teacher was assigned and placed in each of three schools in the sample. All held licenses in English and taught students in grades 7, 8, and 9. Their teaching service was 2, 2.5, and 11 years, respectively.

Two of the schools received five teachers each for career guidance. In one school experience was reported only as "0-5" years; in the other it ranged from 1.5 years to 35 years, the latter figure representing a mathematics teacher assigned to this program. The licenses reported in the two schools were social studies (three), mathematics (two), industrial arts (two), and health education (one). These teachers conducted ninth-grade classes on a full-time basis.

Although program plans called for 14 teachers to be assigned in the six schools to reduce class size, three of the six reported these positions unfilled. Thus seven teachers were actually received and utilized to reduce class size. In one school, although both teachers held a social studies license, one was teaching science classes. These two teachers had less than one year's experience.

In a second school, both teachers held English licenses and taught English in all grades. They each had 2.5 years of experience. In the third school, three teachers held the social studies, mathematics, and common branches licenses, with 1, 2, and 3 years of teaching experience, respectively. They taught grades 7, 8, and 9, and in mathematics, social studies, science, and language arts. The median years of experience for teachers in positions to reduce class size was two years.

A feature of the program in junior high schools was the assignment of additional preparation periods to teachers. These were placed, however, in special service schools only, with none allotted to those selected for the sample in this study. The project listed 44 teachers for this purpose.

Tables $A^4$ and $A^5$ (Appendix $A^4$, $A^5$) indicate the totals of additional staff and services assigned in the transitional area schools. These may be compared with the sample schools in the study.

In the total group, for elementary schools, the greatest number of staff assigned was for reduction of class size, for corrective reading, and for school secretaries. In the sample group, the emphasis is the same, with the special distinction that the number of teachers assigned for corrective reading and for secretary positions was nearly identical.

In the junior high schools, the situation was almost the same for: teachers to reduce class size, preparation periods, career guidance teachers, and school secretaries.

It seems significant and worthy of further study to note that, while in the elementary sample almost all positions assigned to reduce class size were filled, in the junior high sample only 50 per cent of the positions assigned for this purpose were filled.

## V ANALYSIS OF ADDITIONAL SERVICES IN THE PROGRAM

### Special Classes and Clubs

Since the additional personnel are intended to extend available and existing services, the organizing of special classes and clubs for the gifted and slow would represent an attractive enrichment opportunity for pupils.

The questionnaire to elementary principals brought forth the following information from the sample: Classes and clubs were organized for creative writing, art, music, remedial reading, mathematics, science, language arts, the non-English speaking, and the intellectually gifted.

Distributions of classes in these special programs may be seen in the table, Appendix A[6].

These activities cannot be ascribed to the transitional areas program alone. Several were expanded by means of the program; others existed prior to the program and were reported as continuing enrichment activities within the program.

There may be a reflection here of the desire on the part of principals to report their own initiative, undertaken in advance of the transitional areas program or concurrently with it, to accomplish identical goals. Frequently where teachers were received (science, math, remedial reading), they were incorporated into the regular instruction program and not reported as providing "special" classes.

Eight of the schools in the sample indicated procedures used to evaluate the special classes. Each of the schools reported using teacher-made and standardized tests in reading, mathematics, music, and science. Also reported were exhibits, fairs, and concerts by four schools. One school reported evaluation in terms of greater pupil interest in the special classes.

While programs are often planned to individualize pupil activities, a frequent criticism is the lack of innovative procedures. The questionnaire to principals sought to elicit response as to "curricular adaptations" in the special classes. Nine of the 18 responding principals reported the following types of curriculum adaptations.

Comments were made referring to "in-depth discussion," use of more source material than usual, and use of "discovery" in mathematics. In one school, the teacher of the gifted served as a teacher trainer in this area. In another school, special materials were purchesed for children receiving help in reading.

A new experimental "developmental music" program was begun in grades 1, 2, and 3 in one school. Special "auditorium music periods" were instituted for classes on split sessions in one overcrowded school. Three principals reported: "games, different basal readers, small groups, individual help." Another reported: "pre-instrumental groups in grades three and four; use of Zoltan Kodaly hand signals to train glee club...."

One principal stressed correlation of art with social studies, of science with language arts, mathematics, and art. Another reported enrichment in science and "more than the usual number of trips."

It would appear that, although personnel were added to the schools in given special teaching fields, it was possible for individual principals to seek varied and unprescribed uses for such teachers in their attempts to emphasize the enrichment aspects of the program.

In the junior high school sample, five principals indicated that additional staff did facilitate the development of special classes or clubs for the slow and for the gifted. The table in Appendix A7 presents the data on special classes and clubs at the junior high level.

All principals stated that the activities listed in Table A7 were conducted during the school day and not as part of the after-school center. Evaluation was conducted by periodic teacher-made and standardized tests.

Curriculum adaptations included a "basic" and an "intensive" reading program in one school. A second school reported production of a literary magazine and a pageant. Musically gifted pupils pursued this talent instead of taking a shop class. Throughout, principals placed special emphasis on the use of assigned additional teachers for facilitating or providing remedial reading instruction.

## Library

Although only three librarians were assigned and only two positions filled in the sample elementary schools, it was of interest to note that almost all principals responded to the items on libraries. Altogether ten additional library positions were assigned to all the 79 elementary schools in the program.

Designation of a school as "transitional" and assignment of various additional personnel may affect library service, changes in use and effectiveness, and variations in circulation. The sample schools provided some interesting data about library activities in the transitional community.

In only one of the responding schools did the librarian have a master's degree in library science. Teachers assigned in the two schools in this program had course work in library service and in literature.

Percentages of time devoted to library service were distributed as follows: 100 per cent - ten schools; 90 to 95 per cent - two schools; 80 to 85 per cent - two schools; 70 to 75 per cent - two schools; 40 per cent - one school.

All but two of the principals reported favorable feelings about library service in their schools. They indicated that circulation increased, that there were more books in greater varieties, that there was more pupil interest, and that there was more collaboration between the teachers and librarian. Two principals reported no change in effectiveness of service as compared with the previous year.

Six principals replied that changes in library services could be attributed to the transitional areas program. They referred to greater pupil interest and motivation due to the placement of teacher subject-matter specialists and to after-school clubs. More individualized attention to pupils was also seen as affecting demands upon the library. Only one principal cited a decline in pupil cooperation and more book losses.

With regard to actual circulation, data were available from 11 schools. One school reported a drop of approximately 25 per cent over the previous year. The others showed an increase in total circulation ranging from 5 per cent to 98 per cent. The median increase was 32.5 per cent.

One of the schools receiving a librarian reported a total circulation gain of 33 per cent; the other a gain of 98 per cent.

In the terms of the categories of the Dewey Classification system, increases were general, with the median per cent increases summarized in the table in Appendix A[8].

The figures presented may not indicate a direct relationship between the assignment of a librarian in a school and a circulation increase. However, all schools reporting were in the transitional program, and all showed an increase in total circulation figures. This may warrant the conclusion, upon further intensive study, that the assignment of various additional personnel in the transitional areas program will result in greater library use and effectiveness. The addition of more books in an existing library with no change in personnel may have much to do with producing such results.

In the junior high school sample, five of the six schools received one additional librarian. As reported by the principals, none of these five librarians had a degree in library science. All were assigned full-time. Particular training for this service ranged from "none" to ninety hours in library science. Two teachers reported thirty hours of course work and one had had a three-credit course.

Principals who received additional librarian service were unanimous in their statements regarding the effectiveness of the service. All indicated more use of the library by pupils, classes, and teachers. More actual time was available in the library, and more librarian time was available for visits to classes.

In relation to curriculum, principals pointed out that teachers were able to make better use of library materials in their subjects. Pupils undertook individual research in the library with the help of additional staff.

As a quantitative reflection of improved library function, circulation figures are shown in Appendix A9.

The data reflect, in all areas, expanded circulation and use of books. In noting the great contrast between growth in "general works," "Philosophy" and "Religion" and in the others, one may assume that books were made available which were not on hand before. It is also likely that the increased library service encouraged teachers and students to make use of the anthologies, collections, and specific items in these categories.

Guidance

In addition to the teaching and curricular features to be provided the transitional schools, an important aspect was to be pupil guidance. Schools in which pupils' problems are studied, in which teachers and specialists work with individuals and groups to provide them with conditions that will promote learning or help remedy conditions that hinder it, are considered to be good schools. Thus, it may be reasonable to assume that expansion of counseling services would be a deterrent to migration of families.

Additional guidance counselors in the total group of 79 elementary schools numbered 30, or 7 per cent of all the added staff. In the 37 junior high schools, 18 guidance counselors, or 6 per cent of all additional staff were added.

Of the 13 additional guidance counselors assigned to the sample elementary schools, 9 were received. Eight of the principals receiving additional guidance counselors returned the portion of the questionnaire referring to this service. These portions were "to be completed by person-in-charge of Guidance and Counseling Service."

One replied that individual counseling was not expanded but that group counseling activities were.

The other seven reported that more children referred by teachers were being seen individually. In describing expansion of individual counseling, respondents listed more sessions individually per week, more screening for CRMD placement, and more referrals to the Bureau of Child Guidance.

Four statements indicated that children were seen in grades K through six on a weekly and monthly basis.

As to types of counseling problems encountered with the expanded service, several replies indicated "more children, same problems;" "more referrals on learning problems and on withdrawn behavior." One specified: "more learning problems seen, not just crisis cases."

Most of the schools reported no new programs as compared with the previous year, but one noted earlier screening in grades one and two.

Additional comments referring to use of counselor time included service as "resource person for teachers," "guidance in test taking" for sixth grades. Groups were formed for guidance purposes, but the greatest part of counselors' time was spent with individuals. No new group guidance projects were established by additional personnel, except for one citizenship class (register of nine).

All questionnaires reported that increased contacts between teachers and guidance counselors had resulted from transitional areas programs. Such contacts took the form of individual conferences, grade level meetings, and an inservice workshop and study group during the lunch hour.

In all cases, there were increased contacts with parents; more parents were coming to the school. In addition to individual parent conferences, five of the principals reported that workshops for parents had been organized to meet on a regular basis.

Finally, all the replies stated that, with the added guidance personnel, increased contacts had been made with out-of-school agencies for the purpose of specific follow-up of cases, for conferences, and for increased referrals.

Of the six schools in the junior high sample, five guidance counselors were assigned and replies to the questionnaire items were received from four principals.

All indicated that the additional counselor was used to expand individual counseling services, so that in each of the grades more students were reached.

Two principals reported that now different types of problems were encountered: problems related to family and social situations and those related to vocational and educational concerns. As compared with the previous year, more "nondirective" counseling was being attempted and more referrals were being made to agencies.

Individual counseling took 100 per cent of the counselors' time in two schools, 60 per cent and 40 per cent in two others.

In the four schools reporting, group guidance was both attempted, in a ninth grade, and supported through teachers' inservice workshops. Curriculum bulletins in group guidance were being prepared to assist teachers. The amount of teachers' time spent in group guidance was reported as 15 per cent in one school and five per cent in another.

In general, group guidance was seen primarily as assistance to teachers whose work is with class groups, and more remotely as work with groups of students in the ninth grade who may need pre-high school orientation.

In three of the schools, additional counselors resulted in increased contacts with teachers in the form of help with pupil problems, help with parent conferences, and additional counselor-teacher conferences.

All schools reported increased contacts with parents. Finally, additional guidance service increased out-of-school agency contacts. More referrals were made; more follow-up was effected.

At both elementary and junior high levels, increased guidance service was seen as desirable, and the comments tended to recognize the value to pupils and to faculty.

## VI PROGRAM EVALUATION BY PRINCIPALS

Throughout this study, the evidence as to the assignment and activities of additional staff poses a need to give closer attention to the functions of the principal in the transitional area school.

It was the principal who received additional personnel and then determined the scope of their services. Assignment of teachers in art, music, or science might take the form of participation in the regular curriculum and schedule of classes, in part or totally. It might result in a kind of "detachment for enrichment," or other form of teacher assignment.

Similarly, the scope of school secretarial services was the responsibility of the principal, as was the use of the time of guidance counselors and librarians.

The principal determines and directs the ways in which additional school staff will function. He is responsible for informing and orienting the entire faculty with regard to a new school program. In addition, the principal is the primary source of information and orientation to the community and parents of the school; he is responsible to make newly developed efforts and activities promptly known to them.

Finally, the principal remains one of the key figures in the evaluation of the program that has been instituted. It is he, with his staff colleagues, who must determine from first hand experience whether the objectives of the program are being met. Professional evaluation, then, comes first from the principal and from knowledgeable teachers. The evaluation of parents may come in the form of "voting with their feet," a not-unknown phenomenon in urban communities.

For the purposes of evaluation in this study, principals were asked to respond to four questions:

1. In your opinion, is the "transitional areas schools program" an effective way of reducing the emigration of families from the neighborhood and increasing community satisfaction with its schools?

2. In your opinion, why have families left this community?
3. What changes should be made to reduce the emigration of families from transitional neighborhoods?
4. Please list any other projects or programs in your school. Briefly describe the purposes of these programs.

In response to the question, "is the program an effective way of reducing emigration and increasing community satisfaction with its schools?" (question 1), 12 elementary principals said "yes," one said a "limited yes." Four principals said "no," and three did not reply.

Of the six junior high school principals three said "yes," two said "no," and one did not reply to the question.

Comments with "yes" responses included the following:

"This is one way of increasing community satisfaction;"

"special assistance and enrichment have been given;"

the program "helps to reduce migration;"

"the community is working to secure all advantages for the children, through PTA meetings, Board of Education meetings, and meetings with the teachers."

One principal who said "yes" to the program added that "achievement levels rose and parents are pleased."

Another referred to "enrichment and increased services received with satisfaction. There was opportunity for music and corrective math and reading."

Five of the principals who answered "yes" made no comments.

Principals who responded "no" to the program commented that while migration continued there were no indicated complaints or lack of regard for the schools: "no reduced migration. No community complaints about the school;"

"community has high regard for the school; white families leaving daily."

Comments of three junior high school principals emphasized the need for "extended" programs like this one.

Responses to the second question, "why have families left this community," came in several categories. One, the influx of Negro and Puerto Rican families, was reported by ten elementary principals and three junior high school principals. Another, increased family prosperity resulting in moves to suburbs and newer housing, was given by five elementary principals and one junior high principal.

A third reason, related to fear of molestation and inadequate police protection, was stated by five principals. Two principals reported that "block busting" by realtors caused families to leave.

Additional comments referred to fears of overcrowded classes, fears of lower achievement in the schools, more behavior problems in classes, and the desire for children to attend other junior high schools.

One junior high principal replied that "none have left as yet." Another said that more families have moved in than have left.

Principals were then asked to offer recommendations for reducing emigration from the community. Their responses could be grouped in two major categories: provide excellent educational programs; and provide better community facilities.

Under the rubric of an "excellent educational program," the suggestions specified: smaller classes, more guidance services, building of new schools and repairing existing schools, teacher orientation, more ESEA teachers, parent education classes, and quick removal of serious discipline cases in classrooms.

Better community facilities were described as: better housing, more community workers, better police protection, better recreation facilities, and encouragement of new business in the area.

Additional recommendations were that bussing be discontinued at the 50 per cent mark, that slums be removed, and that rezoning of school districts include more white families.

One principal declared the situation of emigration in the transitional areas to be a "gigantic sociological problem" and offered no further comments. Another stated that he did not know what changes could be made.

Responses of principals with regard to other projects and programs described primarily after-school clubs, tutorial, and recreational activities.

Some in-school projects included the use of parent volunteers in the classrooms, work with programmed materials and enrichment publications, tutoring of lower grade pupils by sixth graders, and the organization of classes for the intellectually gifted.

It was not clear to what extent additional personnel assigned under the transitional schools program were involved in the above activities. The implication is that additional personnel provide greater flexibility in the use of all teachers' time and such innovative projects can be organized.

As a further aspect of the key role of the principal, two questions were submitted regarding parents: "as compared with last year, have there been any changes in parents' attitudes toward the school that are reflected in their behavior? Describe. In your opinion can these changes be attributed to the Transitional Areas School Program? Comment."

Eleven of the 18 elementary principals answered "yes" to the first question as did three of the six junior high principals.

At both school levels, principals who reported change in parent attitudes referred to more willing and available school volunteers; they observed a more constructive attitude toward the school on the part of parents; they felt that there were more effective communications between school and parents. In the latter aspect, parent organizations prepared and sent to all homes their publications and handbooks for parents. Responses of parents to calls from schools were made more readily. Principals reported that parents had been expressing their satisfaction with the schools and "bragging" about the services.

As to the second question, "could these changes be attributed to the transitional schools programs," principals in the sample schools were divided. Seven of the principals who noted change in parents' attitudes felt this was a result of the transitional schools program. The other seven did not attribute observed change in parents' attitudes to this program.

Those who linked change with the program referred in their comments to the enriched programs and to increased services. Those who saw no relationship made no response except in two cases: "too early to judge."

One may consider the ability of some principals to see cause and effect relationships in a specific program as being due to their continual contact with the total environment. They may be in constant communication with all the relevant elements in the situation for which they are responsible. They may also be anxious to provide what they consider to be "desired" answers, positive and approving, in the hope that programs they believe to be beneficial will not be withdrawn. This may hold true for any recent or current activities, transitional or other.

On the other hand, one may ascribe the response of some principals in denial of cause and effect situations to their astute powers of observation and their continual contact and communication with the total school environment.

They may see change but recognize no relationship between the program they have conducted in their school and the change.

One might summarize the apparent "conflicts of interest" herein intimated by noting that the majority of respondents noted changes. Since the sample schools were not involved in any other major programs (special service or MES), the change and the transitional program appear to be simultaneous if not indicative of a cause effect relationship. Finally, it should be apparent that while parent attitudes are evaluated by school personnel, parental behavior is significantly expressed in their migration or nonmigration. This form of evaluation will be considered in a later portion of this study.

## VII ANALYSIS OF TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRES

Principals' questionnaires were intended to elicit specific information about the major aspects of the program as well as observations, opinions, and evaluations. Questionnaires to teachers were intended primarily as a reflection of observation of the program at close hand and as a source of additional opinions, comments, and evaluations.

Principals were asked to supply the director of the study with the names of teachers who had been at their schools since September 1963, a period that preceded the program for approximately two years and included the program itself. It was assumed that such teachers could provide informed views and observations of the program and that they had experienced some of the features of a transitional community.

Approximately 500 questionnaires were sent to the teachers whose names were thus supplied in the 18 elementary schools and five junior high schools. Questionnaires were received from a relatively small number: 50 elementary teachers and 55 junior high teachers. The individuals responding represented

12 of the elementary schools and the five junior highs.

Although few in number, teacher responses provided a sample of observations and evaluations which could not have been ascertained otherwise. The summary of responses which follows demonstrates a unanimity of opinion on specific aspects of the program which may indeed provide a valid basis for deriving conclusions.

## Teacher Responses

Most of the teachers returning questionnaires had classes of over 30 pupils. They experienced no change in their assignments, responsibilities, or status as a result of the program.

Asked if they observed an increase in personnel resulting from the program, most teachers said they had. Three elementary and 18 junior high teachers saw no increase in personnel. Eight elementary and four junior high teachers said they did not know.

Teachers who observed additional personnel reported them mostly in the following categories: remedial reading, library (junior high), science, mathematics, and music (elementary).

Elementary teachers stated that over 50 per cent of their pupils were involved to some extent in the program. Junior high teachers said that fewer than 25 per cent of their pupils were involved.

Most teachers responding noted that increased personnel in their schools resulted in changes in services provided to pupils.

With regard to pupil achievement, most elementary teachers reported change as a result of the program; most junior high teachers reported no change in pupil achievement.

With regard to pupil attitude toward school and education, most junior high school teachers noted no change. Elementary teachers were equally divided as to change in pupil attitude. When noting change, program aspects which accounted for it were: remedial reading, guidance, and exposure to more teachers (elementary).

Most elementary teachers noted reductions in class size; junior high teachers were equally divided as to reduced size.

As to change in library service and use, most elementary teachers noted increased size of collections. More than half reported improved services, more library time, and improved pupil attitudes.

Most junior high teachers noted improved library services in all aspects.

Most teachers reported that IGC and SP classes were organized or extended. Junior high teachers noted special music and language classes for gifted pupils.

Teachers placed emphasis on the corrective classes in reading and mathematics, mostly on school time, with some available at after-school centers.

Most elementary teachers reported no increase in guidance personnel and no changes in services. Elementary teachers were equally divided on whether "more pupils are now involved in the guidance program."

Junior high teachers noted more guidance personnel but no increase in services or in numbers of pupils involved.

Most teachers reported no change in pupil attitudes toward guidance services.

With regard to impact of the program on parents and community, most elementary teachers felt there was some. Most junior high teachers did not believe there was any impact.

Those reporting some impact referred to parent expressions of appreciation of new services, more school-community contacts, and more interest in the activities of the school.

In reporting no impact, some teachers referred to parents being unaware of the program, parents not interested, and lack of communication between school and community.

Teachers saw the remedial-tutorial activities as being the most effective aspects of the program in the view of parents and the community.

In answering the question "Why are middle-class families leaving the neighborhood?" teachers cited: influx of minority and low socioeconomic families, poor discipline in the school, and deteriorating housing in the community.

Most teachers did not believe the program "will be effective in stemming the tide of emigration."

Teachers at both levels tended to rate the overall effectiveness of the program as acceptable-to-good. Elementary teachers felt that the main impact of the program was accomplished through increased staff and improved services. Junior high teachers were equally divided on this question.

Most teachers reported no impact on the program through improved faculty morale and motivation.

Should the program be continued, modified, or discontinued? Most teachers recommended that the program be continued or modified with an increase and expansion of staff and services. Stress was placed upon giving more information about the program to teachers and to parents.

## VIII ANALYSIS OF READING ACHIEVEMENT DATA

One of the major ways by which the Transitional Areas School Program proposed to reduce emigration of white middle-class pupils from schools in borderline areas was to improve the educational program in the schools. That is, it was assumed that additional personnel and improved services would produce higher pupil achievement, which in turn would serve as impetus to stabilize the population in the neighborhood and in the school.

This section of the evaluation is designed to answer the question of whether the program produced improvement in achievement, notably in reading achievement as measured by standardized tests.

Nineteen of the 20 elementary schools and all six of the junior high schools comprising the sample of Transitional Schools selected for study, had been part of the program since its inception in September 1965; school L-K, an elementary school, was first funded in September 1966, and for the purpose of this study will be considered separately.

Although we were interested in examining longitudinal test data, some modification was made in the original evaluation design for the elementary schools. Initially, we had planned to include only those pupils who had been in the same school during the period covered by the test dates we were concerned with, and who had taken each of the tests administered during that time span. Inspection of these scores led us to believe that those pupils who met these criteria formed a very small and biased subsample of the population in the schools.

Data collection began in February and extended into June 1967; since we were interested in individual pupil test scores it was necessary to go to each of the schools to collect the appropriate scores directly from the pupils' permanent record card. The average (of word knowledge and reading) grade equivalent scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test of Reading (MAT), administered twice a year as part of the citywide testing program, were collected for each of the pupils in grades 3-9 in the sample schools; test results were available for most children for the school year 1965-66 (the first year of the Transitional Schools Program), 1966-67 (the second and current year of the program) and for 1964-65 (the year prior to the start of the program). Mean scores for each grade in each school were computed.

The main analysis of the elementary grades presented below is based on reading achievement grade equivalent scores of those who had been in the same Transitional School during 1965-66 and 1966-67, regardless of where they had attended school during the year prior to the start of the program. In addition, to be included in the main group, a pupil need have only one score for each of the school years. In other words, each pupil in the two-year comparison had at least (1) a reading score from either the September-October or June 1965-66 administration of the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test, (2) a score from either the September-October or April 1966-67 administration, and (3) a score from the test administered during April of the 1964-65 school year. He may, of course, have had all five reading test scores.

An auxiliary one-year comparison will be presented based on the scores of those pupils who had been in the same elementary Transitional School for the current year only. The results for school L-K will be considered together with this group, although an important difference should be noted. While the one-year pupils were in the school for the current year, they attended schools which have been in the program for two years; school L-K, on the other hand, has completed only its first year of operation.

The data available at the junior high school level are less complete and only one comparison has been made based on the scores of students who have been in the program school since the start of the program. No preprogram (1964-65) scores were readily available for grade 8. These scores were available for the ninth grade pupils in three of the six sample schools.

Average grade equivalent scores will be presented for grades 3-6 and 7-9 for each school separately as well as for the total sample. Deviations from grade placement level will be discussed; citywide test results for each of the test dates will be summarized for each grade.

When considering the summary data, several cautions are advised. Although it is assumed that one-tenth of a grade of growth occurs during each month of the school year, the tests are usually normed only once a year and the intermediate norm values are interpolated. In addition, different forms of the test are alternated and may account for some of the differences noted. Also, different grades get different levels of the MAT and there is some question about the degree of correspondence between scores on different levels. More important, however, is the fact that the following results are longitudinal, based on a relatively stable group of pupils: there is some evidence available in the literature that suggests a positive relationship between stability of a group of students and achievement of these students. As a result generalizations about the program and pupil achievement may be affected by this relationship.

## Reading Achievement - Elementary Schools

The current third grade pupils were tested in the first and seventh months of 1966-67, and in the first and ninth months of the 1965-66 school year when they were in the second grade in the sample Transitional Schools. The mean grade equivalent score was computed for each of the 19 schools separately and is summarized in Table 3. Included in the table are the deviations between the obtained scores and grade placement level, for each school for each test data; citywide scores are also presented. (It is important to keep in mind when comparisons are made with citywide results that the year-to-year citywide scores are not longitudinal, that is, that they are not based on the same pupil population.)

At the beginning of the first year of the program, the current third graders (who were starting grade 2 at that time) were reading at one month better than grade level; the citywide mean score for that date was also one month above grade level. Eleven of the 19 sample elementary schools were reading at or better than grade level; school M-Q was five months advanced in reading, while schools A-M, B-M, and R-Q were achieving three months better than their grade placement level.

By April 1967 the total group of pupils tested at 4.1, four months above grade placement level, and three months better than the achievement of third graders on a citywide basis. Seventeen of the 19 schools were now reading at or above grade level, schools M-Q, P-Q, and R-Q as much as nine months. After almost two years of the program, school C-X and D-X were still performing below grade level; both started out three months retarded in reading in September 1965. While there was no change in rate of retardation for D-X, by April 1967, C-X was retarded by only two school months.

With the exception of D-X and F-X (both of which continued to achieve at the same rate), all other schools improved. That is, in comparing the amount of deviation between obtained score and normal expectancy in September 1965 and again in April 1967, there was a positive increase.

This is reflected in the total gains made between September 1965 and April 1967. During this elapsed instructional time of one year six months, the total group, on the average, gained one year and nine months; nine schools gained two or more years. Only D-X and F-X gained exactly 1.6 years during that interval. A disproportionate amount of the gain, for the total group, occurred during the six-month test interval of the second, 1966-67, program year.

## TABLE 3

## COMPARISON OF THE THIRD GRADE RESULTS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1965-66 AND 1966-67, (SAMPLE SCHOOLS)

| | | Average Grade Equivalent Scores | | | | | | | | Changes in Mean Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1966-67 | | | | 1965-66 | | | | | | |
| | | April 67 | | September 66 | | June 66 | | September 65 | | | | |
| | Range of N | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | 9/65 to 4/67 | 9/65 to 6/66 | 9/66 to 4/67 |
| Grade Placement Norm | | 3.7 | | 3.1 | | 2.9 | | 2.1 | | +1.6 | + .8 | + .6 |
| A-M | 81- 81 | 4.5 | +.8 | 3.5 | +.4 | 3.3 | +.4 | 2.4 | +.3 | +2.1 | + .9 | +1.0 |
| B-M | 99-104 | 4.3 | +.6 | 3.2 | +.1 | 3.4 | +.5 | 2.4 | +.3 | +1.9 | +1.0 | +1.1 |
| C-X | 85- 87 | 3.5 | -.2 | 2.7 | -.4 | 2.6 | -.3 | 1.8 | -.3 | +1.7 | + .8 | + .8 |
| D-X | 31- 35 | 3.4 | -.3 | 2.8 | -.3 | | | 1.8 | -.3 | +1.6 | | + .6 |
| E-X | 82-109 | 4.2 | +.5 | 3.0 | -.1 | 3.2 | +.3 | 2.1 | 0 | +2.1 | +1.1 | +1.2 |
| F-X | 157-156 | 3.7 | 0 | 3.0 | -.1 | | | 2.1 | 0 | +1.6 | | + .7 |
| G-X | 91-122 | 3.1 | +.1 | 2.9 | -.2 | 2.9 | 0 | 2.0 | -.1 | +1.8 | + .9 | + .9 |
| H-K | 82- 88 | 4.3 | +.6 | 3.1 | 0 | 3.2 | +.3 | 2.2 | +.1 | +2.1 | +1.0 | +1.2 |
| I-K | 181-183 | 4.1 | +.4 | 3.1 | 0 | 3.0 | +.1 | 2.2 | +.1 | +1.9 | + .8 | +1.0 |
| J-K | 91-104 | 3.9 | +.2 | 2.9 | -.2 | 2.8 | -.1 | 1.9 | -.2 | +2.0 | + .9 | +1.0 |
| K-K | 92- 96 | 3.8 | +.1 | 3.0 | -.1 | 2.7 | -.2 | 2.0 | -.1 | +1.8 | + .7 | + .8 |
| L-K | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M-Q | 188-189 | 4.6 | +.9 | 3.7 | +.6 | | | 2.6 | +.5 | +2.0 | | + .9 |
| N-Q | 114- 73 | 3.8 | +.1 | 3.1 | 0 | 3.2 | +.3 | 2.0 | -.1 | +1.8 | +1.2 | + .7 |
| O-Q | 51- 53 | 3.8 | +.1 | 2.8 | -.3 | 2.6 | -.3 | 1.8 | -.3 | +2.0 | + .8 | +1.0 |
| P-Q | 132-139 | 4.6 | +.9 | 3.6 | +.5 | 3.4 | +.5 | 2.3 | +.2 | +2.3 | +1.1 | +1.0 |
| Q-Q | 61- 82 | 3.9 | +.2 | 3.2 | +.1 | 3.1 | +.2 | 2.1 | 0 | +1.8 | +1.0 | + .7 |
| R-Q | 51- 54 | 4.6 | +.9 | 3.6 | +.5 | 3.7 | +.8 | 2.4 | +.3 | +2.2 | +1.3 | +1.0 |
| S-Q | 108-110 | 4.0 | +.3 | 3.4 | +.3 | 3.3 | +.4 | 2.2 | +.1 | +1.8 | +1.1 | + .6 |
| T-Q | 91- 97 | 4.3 | +.6 | 3.4 | +.3 | 3.4 | +.5 | 2.2 | +.1 | +2.1 | +1.2 | + .9 |
| Total Sample | 1876-1955 | 4.1 | +.4 | 3.2 | +.1 | 3.1 | +.2 | 2.2 | +.1 | +1.9 | + .9 | + .9 |
| Citywide* | | 3.8 | +.1 | 2.9 | -.2 | 2.9 | 0 | 2.0 | -.1 | +1.8 | + .9 | + .9 |

*Citywide achievement data, 1965-66 to 1966-67, are not based on the same pupil population.

The reading achievement test results for the fourth-grade pupils are summarized in Table 4 below. Included in the table are the scores for the tests administered in 1965-66 (September and June) and in 1966-67 (September and April), the deviations of the obtained scores from grade placement, and the citywide scores.

In September 1965, the total sample fourth grade group of Transitional pupils was already reading at a level one month better than grade placement and two months better than the citywide population. Eleven of the 19 schools achieved at or above grade level. Schools B-M, A-M, and M-Q, scored, in April 1965, six and seven months above the norm respectively.

By April 1967, the date of the most recent testing, 14 of the 19 elementary schools were reading at or above grade placement level of 4.7. The average grade equivalent score for A-M, and R-Q was 5.4, seven months higher than grade level; M-Q achieved at a mean level of 5.5.

During the period September 1965 to April 1967 several trends were apparent: schools A-M, F-X, H-K, I-K, M-Q, P-Q, and R-Q performed at an accelerated rate. Starting initially above grade level, by April 1967 these schools were achieving relatively even more above grade level. Schools E-X, G-X, J-K, and K-K initially achieved at or below grade level; by April 1967 they were performing at better than grade level. Both C-X and N-Q increased in rate of achievement, although by April 1967 they were still performing below grade level.

Although the average achievement for schools B-M, Q-Q, and T-Q in April 1967 was above, below, and at grade level respectively, there was no change in their rate of achievement as compared with their September 1965 mean scores. Schools D-X, and O-Q, and S-Q tended to achieve at a decelerated rate; D-X and O-Q tended to become more retarded, while S-Q lost some of its initial

## TABLE 4

### COMPARISON OF THE FOURTH GRADE RESULTS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1965-66 AND 1966-67, (SAMPLE SCHOOLS).

| | | Average Grade Equivalent Scores | | | | | | | | | | Changes in Mean Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1966-67 | | | | 1965-66 | | | | 1965 | | | | |
| | | April 67 | | September 66 | | June 66 | | September 65 | | April 65 | | 9/65 to 4/67 | 9/65 to 6/66 | 9/66 to 4/67 |
| | Range of N | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | | | |
| Grade Pl. Norm | | 4.7 | | 4.1 | | 3.9 | | 3.1 | | 2.7 | | +1.6 | + .8 | + .6 |
| A-M | 102-107 | 5.4 | +.7 | 4.5 | +.4 | 4.7 | +.8 | 3.6 | +.5 | 3.3 | +.6 | +1.8 | +1.1 | + .9 |
| B-M | 97-108 | 5.0 | +.3 | 4.3 | +.2 | 4.3 | +.4 | 3.4 | +.3 | 3.2 | +.5 | +1.6 | + .9 | + .7 |
| C-X | 74- 80 | 4.6 | -.1 | 3.6 | -.5 | 3.4 | -.5 | 2.7 | -.4 | 2.6 | -.1 | +1.9 | + .7 | +1.0 |
| D-X | 29- 32 | 4.4 | -.3 | 3.6 | -.5 | | | 3.0 | -.1 | 3.0 | +.3 | +1.4 | | + .8 |
| E-X | 83- 91 | 4.9 | +.2 | 4.2 | +.1 | 4.3 | +.4 | 3.0 | -.1 | 2.6 | -.1 | +1.9 | +1.3 | + .7 |
| F-X | 138-119 | 5.0 | +.3 | 4.0 | -.1 | 4.6** | +.7 | 3.2 | +.1 | 3.0 | +.3 | +1.8 | +1.4 | +1.0 |
| G-X | 108-117 | 4.8 | +.1 | 3.6 | -.5 | 3.8 | -.5 | 3.0 | -.1 | 2.7 | 0 | +1.8 | + .6 | +1.2 |
| H-K | 71- 73 | 5.1 | +.4 | 4.2 | +.1 | 4.4 | +.5 | 3.2 | +.1 | 2.9 | +.2 | +1.9 | +1.2 | + .9 |
| I-K | 517-164 | 5.0 | +.3 | 4.1 | 0 | 4.0 | +.1 | 3.2 | +.1 | 3.0 | +.3 | +1.8 | + .8 | + .9 |
| J-K | 127-139 | 4.9 | +.2 | 4.0 | -.1 | 3.9 | 0 | 3.0 | -.1 | 2.8 | +.1 | +1.9 | + .9 | + .9 |
| K-K | 74- 79 | 4.8 | +.1 | 4.2 | +.1 | 4.3 | +.4 | 3.1 | 0 | 2.9 | +.2 | +1.7 | +1.2 | + .6 |
| L-K | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M-Q | 220-212 | 5.5 | +.8 | 4.7 | +.6 | 4.5 | +.6 | 3.8 | +.7 | 3.4 | +.7 | +1.7 | + .7 | + .8 |
| N-Q | 143-149 | 4.6 | -.1 | 3.7 | -.4 | 3.9 | 0 | 2.8 | -.3 | 2.7 | 0 | +1.8 | +1.1 | + .9 |
| O-Q | 58-65 | 4.1 | -.6 | 3.7 | -.4 | 3.6 | -.3 | 2.9 | -.2 | 2.7 | 0 | +1.2 | + .7 | + .4 |
| P-Q | 125-123 | 5.2 | +.5 | 4.3 | +.2 | 4.2 | +.3 | 3.4 | +.3 | 3.1 | +.4 | +1.8 | + .8 | + .9 |
| Q-Q | 96-104 | 4.5 | -.2 | 3.5 | -.6 | 3.8 | -.1 | 2.9 | -.2 | 2.7 | 0 | +1.6 | + .9 | +1.0 |
| R-Q | 57- 59 | 5.4 | +.7 | 4.6 | +.5 | 4.4 | +.5 | 3.5 | +.4 | 3.1 | +.4 | +1.9 | + .9 | +.8 |
| S-Q | 121-133 | 4.8 | +.1 | 4.1 | 0 | 4.0 | +.1 | 3.3 | +.2 | 3.0 | +.3 | +1.5 | + .7 | + .7 |
| T-Q | 90- 93 | 4.7 | 0 | 4.0 | -.1 | 4.5 | +.6 | 3.1 | 0 | 2.8 | +.1 | +1.6 | +1.4 | + .7 |
| Total Sample | 1970-2047 | 4.9 | +.2 | 4.1 | 0 | 4.1 | +.2 | 3.2 | +.1 | 3.0 | +.3 | +1.7 | + .9 | + .8 |
| Citywide* | | 4.6 | -.1 | 3.8 | -.3 | 3.9 | 0 | 3.0 | -.1 | NA | NA | +1.6 | + .9 | + .8 |

---

* See note, Table 3

NA (not available

** This score is based on incomplete data; only some pupils, of those that have other test scores, have a score for this date. The MAT was not widely administered in this school at this time.

advantage. These latter three schools were the only ones of the 19 in the sample that did not gain 1.6 school years in the 1.6 school year interval between September 1965 and April 1967. In general, relatively more gain was made in the September 1966 to April 1967 interval than was made between September 1965 to June 1966.

At the beginning of the current 1966-67 school year, the selected fifth grade pupils in the Transitional Schools were reading two months in advance of grade placement level; six school months later, in April 1967, the average grade equivalent score for this group was 6.3, six months above the 5.7 grade level. Sixteen of the 19 schools were reading at or above grade placement, three of them -- M-Q, P-Q, and R-Q -- by as much as one school year. These results are summarized in Table 5.

In September 1965, at the start of the program, 14 of the schools were reading at or above grade level. During the 1.6 school year interval between the September 1965 and April 1967 administration of the Metropolitan Reading Achievement Test, all schools with the exception of F-X gained at least 1.6 school years in achievement.

All schools, except for D-X which proceeded at the same rate, exhibited an increase in rate of achievement between September 1965 and April 1967. The following schools, initially above grade level, were even more above grade level in April: schools A-M, B-M, F-X, H-K, I-K, K-K, M-Q, N-Q, P-Q, R-Q, S-Q, and T-Q. Schools G-X and O-Q, below grade level in September, were still below grade level in April 1967, but were not as retarded. Schools C-X and J-K went from below to above grade level during that period, and E-X and Q-Q improved from the initial performance at grade level to achieving at better than grade level. The citywide scores also improved during that period, from two months below to grade level.

TABLE 5

## COMPARISON OF THE FIFTH GRADE RESULTS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1965-66 and 1966-67, (SAMPLE SCHOOLS).

| | | Average Grade Equivalent Scores | | | | | | | | | | Changes in Mean Sco | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1966-67 | | | | 1965-66 | | | | 1965 | | | | |
| | | April 67 | | September 66 | | June 66 | | September 65 | | April 65 | | 9/65 to 4/67 | 9/65 to 6/66 | 9/66 to 4/67 |
| | Range of N | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dov. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | | | |
| rade Pl. Norm | | 5.7 | | 5.1 | | 4.9 | | 4.1 | | 3.7 | | +1.6 | + .8 | + .6 |
| A-M | 90- 99 | 6.4 | +.7 | 5.6 | +.5 | 5.7 | +.8 | 4.7 | +.6 | 4.2 | +.5 | +1.7 | +1.0 | + .8 |
| B-M | 104-103 | 6.6 | +.9 | 5.3 | +.2 | 5.3 | +.4 | 4.4 | +.3 | 4.2 | +.5 | +2.2 | + .9 | +1.3 |
| C-X | 76- 76 | 5.8 | +.1 | 4.8 | -.3 | 4.6 | -.3 | 4.0 | -.1 | 3.8 | +.1 | +1.8 | + .6 | +1.0 |
| D-X | 32- 32 | 4.7 | -1.0 | 3.4** | -1.7 | | | 3.1 | -1.0 | 3.0 | -.7 | +1.6 | | +1.3 |
| E-X | 116-127 | 6.0 | +.3 | 5.3 | +.2 | 5.0 | +.1 | 4.1 | 0 | 4.0 | +.3 | +1.9 | + .9 | + .7 |
| F-X | 144-138 | 6.4 | +.7 | 5.4 | +.3 | 3.3** | -1.6 | 4.3 | +.2 | 4.1 | +.4 | +1.1 | -1.0 | +1.0 |
| G-X | 106-109 | 5.6 | -.1 | 4.8 | -.3 | 4.9 | 0 | 3.9 | -.2 | 3.7 | 0 | +1.7 | +1.0 | + .8 |
| H-K | 70- 73 | 6.1 | +.4 | 5.1 | 0 | 5.3 | +.4 | 4.2 | +.1 | 4.0 | +.3 | +1.9 | +1.1 | +1.0 |
| I-K | 188-182 | 6.5 | +.8 | 5.6 | +.5 | 5.3 | +.4 | 4.5 | +.4 | 4.3 | +.6 | +2.0 | + .8 | + .9 |
| J-K | 100-118 | 5.8 | +.1 | 5.0 | -.1 | 4.9 | 0 | 4.0 | -.1 | 3.9 | +.2 | +1.8 | + .9 | + .8 |
| K-K | 79- 75 | 6.4 | +.7 | 5.3 | +.2 | 5.2 | +.3 | 4.3 | +.2 | 4.2 | +.5 | +2.1 | + .9 | +1.1 |
| L-K | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M-Q | 189-174 | 6.8 | +1.1 | 5.7 | +.6 | 5.5 | +.6 | 4.7 | +.6 | 4.4 | +.7 | +2.1 | + .8 | +1.1 |
| N-Q | 121-123 | 6.1 | +.4 | 5.1 | 0 | 5.7 | +.8 | 4.2 | +.1 | 3.8 | +.1 | +1.9 | +1.5 | +1.0 |
| O-Q | 61- 61 | 5.4 | -.3 | 4.5 | -.6 | 3.1** | -1.8 | 3.6 | -.5 | 3.7 | 0 | +1.8 | - .5 | + .9 |
| P-Q | 144-138 | 6.7 | +1.0 | 5.8 | +.7 | 5.6 | +.7 | 4.5 | +.4 | 4.2 | +.5 | +2.2 | +1.1 | + .9 |
| Q-Q | 82- 87 | 6.0 | +.3 | 5.1 | 0 | 5.5 | +.6 | 4.1 | 0 | 4.0 | +.3 | +1.9 | +1.4 | + .9 |
| R-Q | 70- 72 | 7.1 | +1.4 | 5.4 | +.3 | 5.3 | +.4 | 4.4 | +.3 | 4.2 | +.5 | +2.7 | + .9 | +1.7 |
| S-Q | 129-135 | 6.4 | +.7 | 5.6 | +.5 | 5.5 | +.6 | 4.6 | +.5 | 4.3 | +.6 | +1.8 | + .9 | + .8 |
| T-Q | 91- 82 | 6.1 | +.4 | 5.1 | 0 | 5.0 | +.1 | 4.2 | +.1 | 3.9 | +.2 | +1.9 | + .8 | +1.0 |
| Total Sample | 1992-2004 | 6.3 | +.6 | 5.3 | +.2 | 5.2 | +.3 | 4.3 | +.2 | 4.1 | +.4 | +2.0 | + .9 | +1.0 |
| Citywide* | | 5.7 | 0 | 4.8 | -.3 | 4.8 | -.1 | 3.8 | -.3 | 3.5 | -.2 | +1.9 | +1.0 | + .9 |

*See note, Table 3

**See note, Table 4

The achievement data for the sixth grade pupils who were in the same Transitional School for the past two years are presented in table 6. Four of the Transitional Elementary Schools, F-X, I-K, J-K, and R-Q, do not have any sixth grade classes.

In September 1965, when the current group of sixth graders were in the fifth grade they were, as a group, achieving five months in advance of grade level -- four months better than the citywide population. Twelve of the 15 schools were reading, on the average, at or better than their grade placement. By April 1967 the total group tested at 7.5, six months better than grade level of 6.7, with 12 of the 15 schools at or in advance of grade level. However, in the one year, six month interval between September 1965 and April 1967 only schools G-X, H-K, K-K, M-Q, N-Q, Q-Q, S-Q, and T-Q gained a total of 1.6 or more school years.

Schools A-M, B-M, D-X, G-X, K-K. M-Q, P-Q, Q-Q, S-Q, and T-Q were achieving at better than grade placement level in September 1965. By April 1967, A-M, B-M, D-X, G-X, K-K, M-Q, P-Q, Q-Q, S-Q, and T-Q were still above grade level, but except for five schools (G-X, K-K, Q-Q, S-Q, and T-Q) the relative rate tended to decrease.

School C-X, initially reading at grade level, was two months retarded in April 1967; for D-X the reading rate had decelerated, although in April they were still above grade placement. Schools E-X and O-Q were relatively more retarded in reading in April 1967 than they were in September 1965.

During the six month interval between the September 1966 and April 1967 administration of the Metropolitan Achievement Tests, the total sample gained six months; during the eight-month interval of the previous school year, the same pupils averaged a gain of seven months.

## TABLE 6

## COMPARISON OF THE SIXTH-GRADE RESULTS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1965-66 AND 1966-67, (SAMPLE SCHOOLS).

| | | Average Grade Equivalent Scores | | | | | | | | | | Changes in Mean Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1966-67 | | | | 1965-66 | | | | 1965 | | | | |
| | | April 67 | | September 66 | | June 66 | | September 65 | | April 65 | | | | |
| | Range of N | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | 9/65 to 4/67 | 9/65 to 6/66 | 9/66 to 4/67 |
| rade Pl. orm | | 6.7 | | 6.1 | | 5.9 | | 5.1 | | 4.7 | | +1.6 | + .8 | + .6 |
| A-M | 99-103 | 7.4 | +.7 | 7.0 | +.9 | 6.8 | +.9 | 6.1 | +1.0 | 5.6 | +.9 | +1.3 | + .7 | + .4 |
| B-M | 133-150 | 7.1 | +.4 | 6.7 | +.6 | 6.6 | +.7 | 5.9 | +.8 | 5.2 | +.5 | +1.2 | + .7 | + .4 |
| C-X | 79- 77 | 6.5 | -.2 | 5.9 | -.2 | 4.9 | -1.0 | 5.1 | 0 | 4.4 | -.3 | +1.4 | - .2 | + .6 |
| D-X | 68- 65 | 6.8 | +.1 | 6.2 | +.1 | | | 5.4 | +.3 | 4.9 | +.2 | +1.4 | | + .6 |
| E-X | 97-100 | 6.3 | -.4 | 5.6 | -.5 | 5.2 | -.7 | 4.9 | -.2 | 4.5 | -.2 | +1.4 | + .3 | + .7 |
| F-X | | No Sixth Grade | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| G-X | 91- 92 | 7.1 | +.4 | 6.3 | +.2 | 5.8 | -.1 | 5.2 | +.1 | 4.6 | -.1 | +1.9 | + .6 | + .8 |
| H-K | 71- 73 | 7.3 | +.6 | 6.2 | +.1 | 5.5 | -.4 | 5.1 | 0 | 4.8 | +.1 | +2.2 | + .4 | +1.1 |
| I-K | | No Sixth Grade | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| J-K | | No Sixth Grade | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| K-K | 101- 99 | 7.6 | +.9 | 6.9 | +.8 | 7.4 | +1.5 | 5.6 | +.5 | 5.2 | +.5 | +2.0 | +1.8 | + .7 |
| L-K | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| M-Q | 167-160 | 8.0 | +1.3 | 7.7 | +1.6 | | | 6.4 | +1.3 | 5.9 | +1.2 | +1.6 | | + .3 |
| N-Q | 133-146 | 7.1 | +.4 | 6.6 | +.5 | 6.5 | +.6 | 4.9 | -.2 | 5.1 | +.4 | +2.2 | +1.6 | + .5 |
| O-Q | 68- 72 | 5.7 | -1.0 | 5.4 | -.7 | 4.0 | -1.9 | 4.8 | -.3 | 4.1 | -.6 | + .9 | - .8 | + .3 |
| P-Q | 141-149 | 7.9 | +1.3 | 7.5 | +1.4 | 7.1 | +1.2 | 6.5 | +1.4 | 5.6 | +.9 | +1.4 | + .6 | + .4 |
| Q-Q | 86- 82 | 7.0 | +.3 | 6.1 | 0 | 5.9 | 0 | 5.3 | +.2 | 4.7 | 0 | +1.7 | + .6 | + .9 |
| R-Q | | No Sixth Grade | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| S-Q | 148-149 | 7.6 | +.9 | 7.0 | +.9 | 6.7 | +.8 | 5.9 | +.8 | 5.4 | +.7 | +1.7 | + .8 | + .6 |
| T-Q | 89- 92 | 7.9 | +1.2 | 6.7 | +.6 | 6.8 | +.9 | 5.6 | +.5 | 5.2 | +.5 | +2.3 | +1.2 | +1.2 |
| otal ample | 1571-1609 | 7.3 | +.6 | 6.7 | +.6 | 6.3 | +.4 | 5.6 | +.5 | 5.1 | +.4 | +1.7 | + .7 | + .6 |
| itywide* | | 6.7 | 0 | 6.1 | 0 | 5.9 | 0 | 5.2 | +.1 | 4.4 | -.3 | +1.5 | + .7 | + .6 |

* See note, Table 3

In summary, the average grade equivalent reading scores of those pupils who have been in the same elementary Transitional Schools since September 1965 were higher than the scores of the citywide population. As of April 1967, the third grade students in about 89 per cent of the sample schools were reading at or above grade level. The total group of third grade pupils studied were achieving four months better than grade expectancy. The fourth grade results indicate that approximately 74 per cent of the schools were reading at or above grade level in April 1967; the sample students averaged two months above grade placement level and three months better than the citywide population. The fifth graders were reading at a level two months better than their grade placement in April 1967; about 74 per cent of the sample schools achieved at or higher than grade level. The sixth-grade findings were also favorable; by April 1967 the total group was reading at 7.3, six months better than their grade placement at the time of testing.

There were differences between schools; school D-X in general did not show great change. There was no relative change in improvement in the reading performance of third and fifth graders during the two program years. On the other hand, schools G-X, H-K, I-K, J-K, K-K, and R-Q, for example, showed improvement in reading performance at every grade, 3-6.

Table 7 compares the reading performance of recent arrivals, pupils who were in the sample Transitional Elementary Schools starting in September 1966 (called the "second year group"), with the performance of pupils who had been in the same schools since at least the start of the program (called the stable group). This latter group is the population described above. Also in Table 7 are the results for school L-K, which completed its first program year, and the citywide reading achievement grade equivalent mean score for 1966-67. The second year group is composed of students from all 19 sample elementary schools.

The second year, third grade group was five months retarded in reading in September 1966, and although they were still retarded in April 1967, there was a slight decrease in amount of retardation: they were four months below the citywide mean. A similar trend is noted for the fourth graders; they were six months retarded initially, but by April 1967, they were retarded by five months. Like the third graders, the fourth-grade pupils were achieving four months below the citywide population.

Fifth grade pupils starting in the program in September 1966 were seven months below grade level. By April 1967 their relative retardation had decreased by one month, although they were still six months below grade placement, and 1.2 years below the achievement level of the stable group in the same schools. The second year, sixth-grade group had a mean score of 5.5 in September 1966, six months below grade placement and 1.2 years below the stable group. By April they were retarded by five months.

These results suggest that the Transitional Program in its second year of operation may have some positive effect on achievement (the rate of retardation for the recent arrivals was slightly improved). There is, further, some indication that (1) pupil stability may also be highly related to achievement, and/or (2) the effects of the Transitional School Program are cumulative.

### Reading Achievement - Junior High School

The program started for the seventh graders in September 1966, when the students entered the Transitional Junior High Schools. Table 8 summarizes the average grade equivalent scores for the September 1966 and April 1967 administrations of the Metropolitan Achievement Test for each of the seventh grades in the sample schools. For five of these six schools, test results

## TABLE 7

### COMPARISON OF THE RESULTS OF THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1966-67, FOR THE PUPILS IN THE SAMPLE SCHOOLS DURING THE CURRENT YEAR

| | 1966-67 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | April 67 | | September 66 | | Gain 9/66 to 4/67 |
| | Mean Score | Deviation | Mean Score | Deviation | |
| Grade 3 Norm | 3.7 | | 3.1 | | + .6 |
| School L-K | 3.5 | - .2 | 2.7 | - .4 | + .8 |
| Second yr. group | 3.4 | - .3 | 2.6 | - .5 | + .8 |
| Citywide* | 3.8 | + .1 | 2.9 | - .2 | + .9 |
| Stable group | 4.1 | + .4 | 3.2 | + .1 | + .9 |
| Grade 4 Norm | 4.7 | | 4.1 | | |
| School L-K | 4.1 | - .6 | 3.5 | - .6 | + .6 |
| Second yr. group | 4.2 | - .5 | 3.5 | - .6 | + .6 |
| Citywide* | 4.6 | - .1 | 3.8 | - .3 | + .8 |
| Stable group | 4.9 | + .2 | 4.1 | 0 | + .8 |
| Grade 5 Norm | 5.7 | | 5.1 | | |
| School L-K | 4.7 | -1.0 | 3.6 | -1.5 | +1.1 |
| Second yr. group | 5.1 | - .6 | 4.4 | - .7 | + .7 |
| Citywide* | 5.7 | 0 | 4.8 | - .3 | + .9 |
| Stable group | 6.3 | + .6 | 5.3 | + .2 | +1.0 |
| Grade 6 Norm | 6.7 | | 6.1 | | |
| School L-K | 6.0 | - .7 | 4.9 | -1.2 | +1.1 |
| Second yr. group | 6.2 | - .5 | 5.5 | - .6 | + .7 |
| Citywide* | 6.7 | 0 | 6.1 | 0 | + .6 |
| Stable group | 7.3 | + .6 | 6.7 | + .6 | + .6 |

* See note, Table 3

from the June 1966 administration were also available; at this time these pupils should have been achieving at 6.9. Actually, prior to entering junior high schools, the average grade equivalent scores of these pupils was 7.7, eight months advanced in reading achievement, while J-C-X was one month retarded; the other schools were all reading above grade level.

By September 1966 the same pupils, then in the first month of the seventh grade, generally tested at or above grade level. With the exception of J-B-X, the seventh graders were reading at between grade level and eight months above grade level. However, for most of the schools, the difference between actual and theoretical performance had decreased; the total sample was only three instructional months advanced in reading.

Further decreases, for each of the schools, were apparent by the end of the program year. At the time of the April 1967 testing, only three of the six seventh grades studied were reading at or better than grade level; even those schools, J-A-M, J-D-K, and J-E-K, were doing less well comparatively than they had been doing at the beginning of the current school year.

In the six-month period between the September and April administrations, all seventh grades did exhibit some growth, but no school gained more than five months during this period. More striking, however, is the comparison in scores between June 1966 and April 1967, an elapsed time of eight months. During this period only two seventh grades, J-C-X, and J-F-Q, made any positive gain; all other schools were performing relatively less well after the program than they had been during the year prior to the start of the program. It is interesting to note that J-C-X and J-F-Q were the schools reading below and slightly above -- but close to -- grade level in June 1966; the other schools were more advanced at that time.

## TABLE 8

### COMPARISON OF THE SEVENTH GRADE RESULTS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1965-66 AND 1966-67, (JUNIOR HIGH SAMPLE SCHOOLS)

| | | Average Grade Equivalent Scores | | | | | | Changes in Mean Score | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1966-67 | | | | 1966 | | | |
| | | April 67 | | September 66 | | June | | | |
| | Range of N | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | 9/66 to 4/67 | 6/66 to 4/67 |
| Grade Placement Level | | 7.7 | | 7.1 | | 6.9 | | +.6 | +.8 |
| J-A-M | 124-398 | 8.3 | +.6 | 7.9 | +.8 | 9.7 | +1.8 | +.4 | -1.4 |
| J-B-X | 225-228** | 6.3 | -1.4 | 6.2 | -.9 | | | +.1 | |
| J-C-X | 185-309 | 7.3 | -.4 | 7.3 | +.2 | 6.8 | -.1 | 0 | +.5 |
| J-D-K | 169-378 | 7.7 | 0 | 7.4 | +.3 | 7.8 | +.9 | +.3 | -.1 |
| J-E-K | 168-369 | 7.9 | +.2 | 7.7 | +.6 | 8.2 | +1.3 | +.2 | -.1 |
| J-F-Q | 232-298 | 7.6 | -.1 | 7.1 | 0 | 7.1 | +.2 | +.5 | +.5 |
| Total Sample | 878-1980 | 7.6 | -.1 | 7.4 | +.3 | 7.7 | +.8 | +.2 | +.6 |
| Citywide* | | 7.6 | -.1 | 6.8 | -.3 | 7.0 | +.1 | +.8 | +.6 |

* See note, Table 3

** 10/66 to 4/67.

Citywide achievement test scores were available for June 1966, September 1966, and April 1967, and are summarized in Table 8. The seventh-grade classes in the sample Transitional Junior High Schools compare favorably with the citywide results. Of course, the citywide scores are not longitudinal, and there is strong reason to believe that the less mobile students who took most of the tests (in our sample) would achieve at a somewhat higher level. The sample seventh graders in September were not only reading three months in advance of grade level, but were six months more advanced than the seventh grade pupils in the city; however, this initial lead was lost during the year and by April all were reading at one month below grade level. During this interval of six months in which the program was operative, citywide pupils made gains of eight months, as compared with the already-noted gain of only two months for the sample schools.

The eighth-grade students had been in the program since September 1965, the entire span of their junior high school experience. Beginning and end-year reading achievement test scores were available for the first year of the program (1965-66) when the current eighth graders were in grade 7 in the Transitional Junior High Schools, and for the current 1966-67 school year. The average grade equivalent reading scores for each of the test dates for each of the schools separately are summarized in Table 9. Note that no preprogram scores were collected for these groups of students.

The MAT was administered in the first (8.1) and seventh (8.7) months of the 1966-67 year. In September 1966, the sample schools averaged one month below grade placement level, although four of the six schools were reading at or better than grade level. By April 1967, only one school (J-A-M) was reading at better than grade level -- the total group was five months retarded in reading; with the exception of J-A-M, all schools performed relatively more

## TABLE 9

## COMPARISON OF THE EIGHTH-GRADE RESULTS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1965-66 AND 1966-67
## (JUNIOR HIGH SAMPLE SCHOOLS)

| | | Average Grade Equivalent Scores | | | | | | | | Changes in Mean Score | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1966-67 | | | | 1965-66 | | | | | | |
| | | April 67 | | September 65 | | June 65 | | September66 | | 9/65 to 4/67 | 9/65 to 6/66 | 9/66 to 6/67 |
| | Range of N | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | | | |
| Grade Pl. Level | | 8.7 | | 8.1 | | 7.9 | | 7.1 | | +1.6 | +.8 | +.6 |
| J-A-M | 297-358 | 8.8 | +.1 | 8.1 | 0 | 7.5 | -.4 | 7.4 | +.3 | +1.4 | +.1 | +.7 |
| J-B-X | 328-361 | 7.5 | -1.2 | 7.7 | -.4 | 5.9** | -2.0 | 6.5 | -.6 | +1.0 | -.6 | -.2 |
| J-C-X | 310-307 | 8.3 | -.4 | 8.2 | +.1 | | | 7.0 | -.1 | +1.3 | | +.1 |
| J-D-K | 281-300 | 8.5 | -.2 | 8.2 | +.1 | 7.9 | 0 | 7.0 | -.1 | +1.5 | +.9 | +.3 |
| J-E-K | 399-430 | 8.1 | -.6 | 7.8 | -.3 | 7.0 | -.9 | 6.9 | -.2 | +1.2 | +.1 | +.3 |
| J-F-Q | 215-248 | 8.3 | -.4 | 8.1 | 0 | 7.0 | -.9 | 6.9 | -.2 | +1.4 | +.1 | +.2 |
| Total Sample | 1830-2004 | 8.2 | -.5 | 8.0 | -.1 | 7.3 | -.6 | 6.9 | -.2 | +1.3 | +.4 | +.1 |
| Citywide* | | 8.2 | -.5 | 8.1 | 0 | 7.5 | -.4 | 7.1 | 0 | +1.1 | +.4 | +.1 |

* See note, Table 3

** See explanation, Table 4

poorly at the end of the year than they had at the beginning of the year. School J-B-X, for example, had begun the year four months below grade level, but was one year two months below grade by April 1967.

The results for the same children during the previous year, the first year of the program, were similar. In September 1965 the pupils were two months retarded in reading, and by the end of the first year they averaged six months below grade level norms. At the end of that year, only pupils in J-D-K were reading at grade level.

One year and six months elapsed between the initial testing in September 1965 and the final end-year testing in April 1967. During that span, each of the sample schools gained at least one year in reading; school J-D-K gained one year and four months. The average gain was one year, three months. Relatively more of the gain seemed to occur during the first year of the program.

Citywide, the growth between September 1965 and April 1967 was one year, one month -- two months less gain than that of the sample pupils. Initially, the citywide mean achievement score was two school months higher than the September 1966 score for the Transitional Sample; the two-month difference was maintained in the June 1966 testing, but by September 1966 the difference had been reduced to one month. In April 1967 both the sample eighth graders and the citywide eighth graders were reading five months below grade placement level.

In September 1966, beginning ninth-grade pupils who had been in the Transitional Junior High Schools the previous year were reading, on the average, one month above grade level; for four of the six schools, the mean level of reading achievement ranged from grade level to five months better than grade level. By April 1967 only the two most advanced schools, J-D-K and J-F-Q, were reading at or above grade level respectively; the total group of ninth graders averaged three months below grade placement. See Table 10.

During the 1965-66 year when the current ninth graders were in grade 8, they tested at three months in advance of grade placement level in September 1965 and were still, on the average, two months advanced in May 1966. School J-A-M, starting out at grade level, made an average gain of one year four months during the seven month interval. J-D-K and J-F-Q were above grade level in reading achievement in May 1966.

During the one year six month interval between September 1965 and April 1967, all schools (data available for five) made positive gains, but not equal to the elapsed time. In that time span, school J-B-X gained only eight months. For the total group there was an average growth of one year. Six months of gain occurred during the interval (seven months) between September 1965 and May 1966, as compared with two months between the six month interval, September 1966 to April 1967.

During the time period September 1965 to April 1967 the ninth graders in the sample and the citywide ninth graders gained one school year in reading achievement, from 8.4 to 9.4 for the Transitional pupils and from 8.1 to 9.1 for the citywide. At the September 1965, May 1966, and September 1966 administrations of the MAT, the sample ninth-grade pupils were not only reading at better than grade level, but were more advanced than the ninth graders citywide. By April 1967 the ninth-grade students in the Transitional Junior High Schools were no longer achieving at grade placement level, but their achievement remained superior to the citywide performance.

In summary, the results for the Junior High Schools in the sample were not favorable. Not only were the pupils in grades 7, 8, and 9 retarded in reading in April 1967, but they were relatively more retarded than they had been at the beginning of the 1966-67 school year.

### TABLE 10

### COMPARISON OF THE NINTH GRADE RESULTS ON THE METROPOLITAN READING ACHIEVEMENT TESTS, 1965-66 AND 1966-67
### (JUNIOR HIGH SAMPLE SCHOOLS)

| | | Average Grade Equivalent Scores | | | | | | | | | | Changes in Mean Sco | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 1966-67 | | | | 1965-66 | | | | 1965 | | | | |
| | | April 67 | | September 66 | | June 66 | | September 65 | | April 65 | | 9/65 to 4/67 | 9/65 to 6/66 | 9/66 to 4/67 |
| | Range of N | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | Mean Score | Dev. | | | |
| Grade Place. | | 9.7 | | 9.1 | | 8.8 | | 8.1 | | 7.4 | | +1.6 | +.7 | +.6 |
| J-A-M | 274-389 | 9.3 | -.4 | 9.0 | -.1 | 9.5 | +.7 | 8.1 | 0 | 7.4 | 0 | +1.2 | +1.4 | +.3 |
| J-B-X | 232-481 | 9.0 | -.7 | 8.9 | -.2 | | | 8.2 | +.1 | | | + .8 | | +.1 |
| J-C-X | 353-344 | 9.5 | -.2 | 9.3 | +.2 | 8.6 | -.2 | 8.0 | -.1 | | | +1.5 | +.6 | +.2 |
| J-D-K | 141-462 | 9.7 | 0 | 9.6 | +.5 | 9.7 | +.9 | 9.1 | +1.0 | 8.4 | +1.0 | + .6 | +.6 | |
| J-E-K | 403-446 | 9.4 | -.3 | 9.1 | 0 | 8.8 | 0 | | | | | | | |
| J-F-Q | 326-324 | 9.8 | +.1 | 9.5 | +.4 | 8.9 | +.1 | 8.7 | +.6 | 7.3 | -.1 | +1.1 | +.2 | +.3 |
| Total Sample | 1326-2446 | 9.4 | -.3 | 9.2 | +.1 | 9.0 | +.2 | 8.4 | +.3 | 7.6 | +.2 | +1.0 | +.6 | +.2 |
| City-wide* | | 9.1 | -.6 | 8.9 | -.2 | 8.2 | -.6 | 8.1 | 0 | 7.1 | -.3 | +1.0 | +.1 | +.2 |

* See note, Table 3

## IX ANALYSIS OF ETHNIC DATA

Ethnic data were collected for all schools designated as transitional areas schools, as noted earlier in this report. From these data, for October 1965, selection of the sample schools was made.

Additional data were obtained for the sample schools for October 1964 and October 1966.

Since the primary objective of the transitional schools program was to maintain community stability, ethnic composition in school enrollment would tend to demonstrate the status of the community.

Although, in the elementary group, a decline was seen in total enrollment (Tables 11, 12, 13,) this was accompanied by an increase in Puerto Rican and Negro pupils year by year.

The greatest increase in enrollment for the Puerto Rican population occurred in the 1964-1965 year. This was, for 18 sample schools, a gain of 19.6 per cent. The increase for this group in the following year, 1965-1966, was much more moderate, 1.2 per cent.

In three of the schools, an overall decrease was found in per cent of enrollment of Puerto Rican pupils from 1964 to 1966.

As a percentage of school populations, the Puerto Rican population ranged from one per cent to 23 per cent in 18 sample elementary schools in October 1964. The median per cent of school population was 7 per cent.

In October 1965, the range for Puerto Rican pupils went from 2 per cent to 31 per cent in the 20 sample schools, with the median at 8.5 per cent.

The range of Puerto Rican enrollment in October 1966 was from 1 per cent to 33 per cent in the 20 schools, with the median per cent of school population at nine.

N

## TABLE 11

## ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: ETHNIC DATA: PUERTO RICAN

| School | October 1964 | | October 1965 | | '64-65 Per Cent Change | October | | '65-66 Per Cent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | | N | % | |
| A - M | 220 | 19 | 162 | 14 | -27 | 153 | 14 | - 6 |
| B - M | 160 | 14 | 163 | 14 | + 2 | 201 | 16 | +23 |
| C - X | 121 | 14 | 172 | 20 | +42 | 269 | 27 | +56 |
| D - X | 156 | 15 | 235 | 20 | +51 | 298 | 25 | +27 |
| E - X | 257 | 23 | 342 | 31 | +33 | 374 | 16 | + 9 |
| F - X | 228 | 18 | 260 | 19 | +14 | 255 | 21 | - 2 |
| G - X | 114 | 13 | 144 | 14 | +26 | 195 | 17 | +35 |
| H - K | 74 | 7 | 85 | 10 | +15 | 48 | 6 | -44 |
| I - K | 38 | 2 | 56 | 4 | +48 | 105 | 7 | +88 |
| J - K | 63 | 1 | 57 | 5 | -10 | 75 | 6 | +32 |
| K - K | 69 | 7 | 58 | 6 | -16 | 113 | 10 | +95 |
| L - K | New | | 281 | 31 | New | 407 | 33 | +45 |
| M - Q | 8 | 1 | 40 | 2 | +400 | 7 | 1 | -83 |
| N - Q | 142 | 10 | 207 | 15 | +46 | 192 | 14 | - 7 |
| O - Q | 21 | 3 | 28 | 4 | +33 | 26 | 3 | - 7 |
| P - Q | New | | 79 | 7 | New | 63 | 5 | -20 |
| Q - Q | 59 | 5 | 55 | 4 | - 7 | 94 | 8 | +71 |
| R - Q | 19 | 3 | 18 | 3 | - 5 | 24 | 5 | +33 |
| S - Q | 62 | 4 | 103 | 7 | +66 | 85 | 7 | -17 |
| T - Q | 74 | 7 | 71 | 6 | - 4 | 64 | 7 | -10 |
| Total Sample | 1885 | | 2616 | | +20 | 2648 | | +1 |

## TABLE 12

## ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: ETHNIC DATA: NEGRO

| School | October 1964 N | October 1964 % | October 1965 N | October 1965 % | '64-65 Per Cent Change | October 1966 N | October 1966 % | '65-66 Per Cent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A - M | 104 | 9 | 271 | 24 | +161 | 257 | 24 | - 5 |
| B - M | 225 | 20 | 295 | 25 | +31 | 307 | 24 | + 4 |
| C - X | 258 | 30 | 322 | 37 | +25 | 440 | 44 | +37 |
| D - X | 344 | 32 | 409 | 34 | +19 | 482 | 40 | +18 |
| E - X | 264 | 24 | 293 | 26 | +11 | 356 | 31 | +22 |
| F - X | 375 | 30 | 409 | 34 | +19 | 482 | 40 | +18 |
| G - X | 366 | 43 | 465 | 45 | +27 | 515 | 45 | +11 |
| H - K | 445 | 44 | 368 | 44 | -17 | 469 | 55 | +27 |
| I - K | 497 | 29 | 554 | 38 | +11 | 664 | 43 | +20 |
| J - K | 351 | 40 | 387 | 35 | +10 | 427 | 36 | +10 |
| K - K | 500 | 50 | 507 | 57 | + 1 | 736 | 67 | +45 |
| L - K | New | | 265 | 29 | New | 335 | 28 | +26 |
| M - Q | 309 | 25 | 694 | 41 | +125 | 773 | 44 | +13 |
| N - Q | 392 | 27 | 382 | 27 | - 3 | 482 | 34 | +26 |
| O - Q | 325 | 42 | 397 | 55 | +22 | 475 | 64 | +20 |
| P - Q | New | | 555 | 47 | New | 614 | 51 | +11 |
| Q - Q | 390 | 31 | 448 | 35 | +15 | 454 | 40 | + 1 |
| R - Q | 354 | 52 | 320 | 54 | -10 | 277 | 60 | -13 |
| S - Q | 723 | 51 | 837 | 54 | +16 | 706 | 55 | -16 |
| T - Q | 483 | 44 | 460 | 41 | - 5 | 378 | 39 | -18 |
| Total Sample | 6705 | | 8638 | | +17 | 9493 | | +10 |

## TABLE 13

### ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: ETHNIC DATA: OTHER

| School | October 1964 | | October 1965 | | '64-65 Per Cent Change | October 1966 | | '65-66 Per Cent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | N | % | N | % | | N | % | |
| A - M | 835 | 72 | 703 | 62 | -16 | 673 | 62 | - 4 |
| B - M | 728 | 65 | 700 | 60 | - 4 | 771 | 60 | +10 |
| C - X | 477 | 56 | 375 | 43 | -21 | 286 | 29 | -24 |
| D - X | 565 | 53 | 544 | 46 | - 4 | 411 | 35 | -24 |
| E - X | 586 | 53 | 483 | 43 | -18 | 414 | 36 | -14 |
| F - X | 636 | 51 | 693 | 51 | +9 | 596 | 50 | -14 |
| G - X | 379 | 44 | 431 | 41 | +14 | 426 | 38 | - 1 |
| H - K | 500 | 49 | 377 | 45 | -25 | 342 | 40 | - 9 |
| I - K | 1157 | 68 | 860 | 59 | -26 | 762 | 50 | -11 |
| J - K | 781 | 60 | 677 | 60 | -13 | 679 | 57 | 0 |
| K - K | 436 | 43 | 328 | 37 | -25 | 257 | 23 | -22 |
| L - K | New | | 371 | 40 | New | 473 | 39 | +27 |
| M - Q | 908 | 74 | 951 | 56 | + 5 | 979 | 56 | + 3 |
| N - Q | 924 | 63 | 825 | 58 | -11 | 736 | 52 | -11 |
| O - Q | 427 | 55 | 297 | 41 | -30 | 245 | 33 | -18 |
| P - Q | New | | 538 | 46 | New | 528 | 44 | - 2 |
| Q - Q | 813 | 64 | 781 | 61 | - 4 | 600 | 52 | -23 |
| R - Q | 312 | 46 | 252 | 43 | -19 | 166 | 36 | -34 |
| S - Q | 621 | 44 | 613 | 39 | - 1 | 497 | 39 | -19 |
| T - Q | 540 | 49 | 581 | 52 | + 8 | 527 | 54 | - 9 |
| Total Sample | 20,625 | | 11,380 | | -50 | 10,368 | | - 9 |

It would appear, therefore, that for the schools in this sample, selected because they were nonsegregated, Puerto Rican pupils tend to represent a growing but small proportion of the school enrollment.

The Negro population has increased consistently in the total sample of 20 schools, gaining 16.5 per cent in the 1964-65 period and 9.8 per cent in the 1965-66 period.

An overall decrease in the percentage of Negro pupils enrolled was found in four schools during the 1964-1966 period.

As a percentage of school enrollments, the Negro population ranged from nine per cent to 52 per cent in October 1964. The median percentage for the 18 schools was 31.5 per cent of enrollment.

In October 1965, the range of Negro pupils enrolled in 20 schools was from 24 per cent to 57 per cent. The median was 37.5 per cent.

One year later, in October 1966, the Negro population in the 20 schools ranged from 24 per cent to 67 per cent, with the median at 41.5 per cent of enrollment.

As compared with the enrollment of Puerto Rican pupils, the Negro population data for the period under consideration show a continual, more rapid rise. In half of the sample schools, while the Puerto Rican population went from seven to nine per cent of enrollment, the Negro pupils increased from 31.5 per cent to 41.5 per cent of school enrollment.

The school population of "others" showed a consistent decline during the same period. For 18 sample schools, from 1964 to 1965, this group decreased 49.2 per cent.

The following year, in October 1966, data showed a drop of 8.8 per cent of enrollment in the 20 sample schools.

An increase in per cent of others enrolled in the three-year period was found in one of the sample elementary schools. This did not represent an overall numerical gain, but was accompanied by a numerical decrease in the Negro and Puerto Rican population.

In October 1964, the range of others enrolled in 18 schools was from 43 per cent of total registration in one school to 74 per cent. The median at that time was 54 per cent.

The range of others enrolled in the 20 sample schools in October 1965 was from 37 per cent to 62 per cent. The median was 47 per cent.

In October 1966, the range of enrollment of others in these schools was from 23 per cent to 62 per cent. The median was 47 per cent.

With regard to the October 1966 data, it is interesting to note that the number of schools showing fewer than 37 per cent others enrolled rose from none in 1965 to six.

Of further interest is what may appear to be a stabilization of increase in Puerto Rican population in the past two years and a smaller rate of decrease in the population of others in the same period. The effects of the program have thus far been accompanied by one sharp movement of others away (in 1965) and a more moderate, but continuing movement thereafter.

For the sample elementary schools, the operation of a transitional schools program has not resulted in nonmigration of "others" in the ethnic distribution. Data for October 1967 will yield further evidence as to developments in the ethnic patterns of these communities.

At the junior high school level, Tables 14, 15, and 16 indicate the data collected and trends in ethnic distribution of school populations.

The six sample schools enrolled a Puerto Rican population which showed an overall decrease, yet in five of the six schools the percentage rose or remained steady from 1964 to 1966.

## TABLE 14

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (SAMPLE): ETHNIC DATA: PUERTO RICAN

| School | October 1964 N | October 1964 % | October 1965 N | October 1965 % | '64-65 Per Cent Change | October 1966 N | October 1966 % | '65-66 Per Cent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| J - A - M | 617 | 28 | 645 | 31 | + 5 | 486 | 28 | -25 |
| J - B - X | 601 | 30 | 595 | 33 | - 1 | 595 | 37 | 0 |
| J - C - X | 605 | 42 | 287 | 17 | -53 | 177 | 12 | -38 |
| J - D - K | 60 | 3 | 72 | 4 | +20 | 112 | 7 | +56 |
| J - E - K | 300 | 14 | 323 | 15 | + 8 | 321 | 18 | - 1 |
| J - F - Q | 20 | 2 | 70 | 6 | +250 | 89 | 7 | +31 |
| Total Sample | 2203 | | 1992 | | -10 | 1780 | | -11 |

## TABLE 15

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (SAMPLE): ETHNIC DATA: NEGRO

| School | October 1964 N | October 1964 % | October 1965 N | October 1965 % | '64-65 Per Cent Change | October 1966 N | October 1966 % | '65-66 Per Cent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| J - A - M | 543 | 25 | 542 | 26 | 0 | 396 | 22 | -27 |
| J - B - X | 543 | 27 | 482 | 27 | -11 | 459 | 29 | - 5 |
| J - C - X | 364 | 25 | 548 | 33 | +51 | 566 | 38 | + 3 |
| J - D - K | 551 | 29 | 672 | 37 | +22 | 678 | 41 | + 1 |
| J - E - K | 224 | 10 | 232 | 11 | + 4 | 252 | 14 | + 9 |
| J - F - Q | 274 | 22 | 235 | 19 | -14 | 309 | 24 | +31 |
| Total Sample | 2499 | | 2711 | | + 8 | 2660 | | - 2 |

## TABLE 16

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS (SAMPLE): ETHNIC DATA: OTHER

| School | October 1964 N | October 1964 % | October 1965 N | October 1965 % | '64-65 Per Cent Change | October 1966 N | October 1966 % | '65-66 Per Cent Change |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| J - A - M | 1023 | 47 | 901 | 43 | -12 | 884 | 50 | - 2 |
| J - B - M | 888 | 44 | 730 | 40 | -18 | 552 | 34 | -24 |
| J - C - X | 486 | 33 | 845 | 50 | +74 | 737 | 50 | -13 |
| J - D - K | 1275 | 68 | 1064 | 59 | -17 | 861 | 52 | -19 |
| J - E - K | 1626 | 76 | 1529 | 73 | - 6 | 1202 | 68 | -21 |
| J - F - Q | 963 | 77 | 947 | 76 | - 2 | 909 | 70 | - 4 |
| Total Sample | 6361 | | 6016 | | - 5 | 5145 | | -14 |

Numerically, therefore, the Puerto Rican enrollment in these schools dropped 9.5 per cent from October 1964 to October 1965. It continued to decrease another 10.6 per cent by October 1966.

For individual junior high schools, Puerto Rican enrollment ranged in October 1964 from 2 per cent to 42 per cent. The median was 21 per cent.

In October 1965, the range for Puerto Rican pupils was from 4 per cent to 33 per cent. At this time, the median was 16 per cent.

The range in October 1966 was from 7 per cent to 37 per cent. The median was 15 per cent.

The Negro population tended to increase steadily in overall enrollment and within each of the sample junior high schools.

The increase in total population of Negro pupils was 8 per cent in October 1965 over the October 1964 figures. The data in October 1966 show a decrease of 2 per cent.

In the six sample junior highs, Negroes represented from 10 per cent to 29 per cent of school enrollments in October 1964. The median was 25 per cent.

In October 1965, the range of Negro enrollment was from 11 per cent to 37 per cent, with a median of 26.5 per cent.

The range of Negro enrollment in October 1966 was from 14 per cent to 41 per cent and the median was 26.5 per cent.

Total enrollment of others showed a decrease in the 1964-1966 period. In October 1965, there was a drop of 5 per cent of others in the school population. There was then a decrease of 14 per cent in enrollment of others by October 1966.

The range of proportionate enrollment of others in the six sample schools in October 1964 was from 33 per cent to 77 per cent. The median was 57.5 per cent.

In October 1965, others ranged from 40 per cent to 76 per cent of enrollment. The median was 54.5 per cent.

Enrollment of others in the sample junior highs in October 1966 ranged from 34 per cent to 70 per cent, with a median of 51 per cent.

As is seen from the changes in ethnic distribution, the Negro population and percentages in individual elementary schools tended to rise. In 1965, the gains were in 14 elementary schools, decreases in four. In 1966, gains were in 15, decreases in five.

For the Puerto Rican population there were increases in 12 schools, decreases in six, in 1965. In 1966, gains were in 11, decreases in nine.

For others, 1965 enrollment decreased in 14 schools and went up in four. In 1966, decreases were in 16 schools, increases in four.

In the junior high sample, Negro enrollments were up in three schools, down in three in 1965. In 1966, they rose in four schools and decreased in two.

Puerto Rican enrollment in 1965 went up in four schools and down in two. In 1965, they fell in three schools, dropped in two, and remained unchanged in one.

Enrollment of others in the junior highs went down in five schools in 1965 and up in one. In 1966, they dropped in all six schools.

The foregoing data indicate that emigration of others has not diminished in the sample transitional schools. One might assume that the sample, containing relatively high enrollment of others which then decreased, would not be unlike all the schools in the program.

It is, therefore, unlikely that at this time the program has had the effect of reducing migration-out of one ethnic group. On the other hand, it is a dubious supposition that the in-migration of other ethnic groups has been due to the features of the transitional schools program. A more reasonable consideration could be given to the continuing pattern of population shifts and movements within the metropolitan community.

## X SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The program under review is titled: "A Special Enrichment Program of Quality Integrated Education for Schools in Transitional Areas." Its major concern is for schools in communities which are "in process of social and economic transition," and its goals are to contribute to community stability through increased specialized services to meet individual pupil's needs.

The program provides additional teaching and non-teaching staff so that specific services of corrective reading, counseling, special classes, and reduced class size may be provided. The program description included better equipped libraries, but no funds were included for books or materials although librarians were designated for assignment as additional personnel. Similarly, after-school study centers were listed as a feature of the program, but no funds were designated nor personnel assigned for this activity under this program.

Although the program functions in 79 elementary and 37 junior high schools, it was noted that many were already designated as special service schools and many could not easily be considered "transitional."

Migration had already produced an imbalance of ethnic groups in many schools so as to render that designation invalid.

A sample of 20 elementary schools and six junior high schools was selected where no other programs (such as "special service") were operating and where ethnic groups included 35 per cent or more of "others."

It was decided to concentrate in this study upon the types and uses of specialist services, the changes in ethnic groupings, the changes in pupils' achievement, and the views of professional staff about the effectiveness of the program.

Questionnaires were sent to the principals and to teachers of long service in the sample schools. Data were collected from these questionnaires which indicated that principals and teachers tend to view programs differently. It was evident that some teachers failed to view the program at all; they did not know it existed in their school.

Principals said they were pleased with the assignment of new personnel and reported that they had assigned teacher-specialists to programs of remedial reading, of enrichment work in art and music, and of teacher training in their schools.

They reported organizing a small number of classes for gifted children and many groups for improvement in reading and coaching in mathematics. Almost all the principals specified that they had received favorable comments from parents about the additional services. They stated that parents showed greater interest and cooperation regarding school matters.

Nevertheless, principals did not feel this program would be effective in reducing migration of middle-class families from their communities. They ascribed migration to the influx of minority group families, to increased delinquency in the area, and to the desire for better housing. On the whole, they called for continuation of this program, seeing it as an improvement in school services for those enrolled.

Teachers who answered the questionnaire tended to agree with principals in their evaluation of the program's effectiveness, and they stated similar causes for the migrations in their communities. They, too, recommended that the program be continued, increased, and expanded, with special stress upon informing teachers and parents about the program.

Teachers who reported commented favorably upon increased library services, more remedial classes, and some enrichment opportunities in music and art. More elementary teachers than junior high teachers noted a positive impact of the program on parents. Teachers in the sample schools were aware that guidance counselors had been added, but they were divided in reporting more guidance service to pupils.

Data on ethnic groups in the schools were obtained from the Board of Education in reports of October 1964, October 1965, and October 1966. In the twenty sample elementary schools, Puerto Rican population increased 20 per cent from 1964 to 1965 and gained 1 per cent more from 1965 to 1966.

Negro population in the twenty elementary schools rose 17 per cent from 1964 to 1965 and thenrose 10 per cent more from 1965 to 1966.

"Others" in the 20 elementary schools dropped 50 per cent from 1964 to 1965 and then dropped 9 per cent more from 1965 to 1966.

In the six sample junior high schools, Puerto Rican enrollment dropped 10 per cent and then 11 per cent in the period studied.

Negro population in the six schools went up 8 per cent from 1964 to 1965, then dropped 2 per cent from 1965 to 1966.

"Others" in the six junior high schools decreased 5 per cent in the first period and 14 per cent by 1966.

The trend reflects emigration of "others" in all the sample schools and an increase of Negro and Puerto Rican pupils in the sample elementary schools. A decreasing register is also seen in the sample junior high group.

Achievement scores in reading were studied for pupils who had been tested prior to the program either in the sample schools or elsewhere, and who were enrolled continuously in the sample school, so as to determine effects of the program upon achievement.

Test results in reading achievement tended to be favorable for pupils in grades 3, 4, 5, and 6, who had been in the transitional schools for one or two years of the program. Mean achievement was generally above grade and above citywide norms. Trends for the most part were toward greater achievement above grade as the time in the program increased.

The results for the junior high schools in the sample were not favorable. Not only were pupils in grades 7, 8, and 9 retarded in reading in April 1967, but they were relatively more retarded than they had been at the start of the program.

In this study, data from the sample schools indicate that school personnel (principals and teachers) approve the program but do not believe it will be effective in maintaining integrated, stable communities.

While school populations have been changing, mean reading scores of stable pupils in the sample elementary schools appeared to improve during the operation of the program. In the junior high sample, trends were lower.

In view of the data and analyses made in this study, I would make the following recommendations:

a. This program should be continued in specifically defined elementary schools in transitional areas.

b. Emphasis should be increased and placed on personnel and services for remedial reading.

c. A further emphasis should be placed upon libraries, enrichment, and guidance activities.

d. Administrative assignments should be limited to those specifically designated for teacher training and support.

e. All teachers should be fully informed about the program and be involved in planning the specific services to be placed in each school.

f. Parents and community people should be fully informed and made aware of the program from the inception of planning. Involvement with faculties of the schools in planning is recommended.

# APPENDIX A

## TABLE A1

## POSITIONS IN TRANSITIONAL AREAS PROGRAM

| Staff Members | 79 Elementary Schools | 37 Junior High |
|---|---|---|
| Teacher | 358 | 166 |
| Teacher aide | 5 | 37 |
| Librarian | 10 | 28 |
| Supervision-Administration | 7 | 16 |
| Clerical | 50 | 40 |
| Counseling, Psychologists, or Testing | 30 | 18 |
| Other | 0 | 19 |
| TOTALS | 460 | 324 |

## TABLE A2

## SAMPLE TRANSITIONAL ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS, ETHNIC DATA, OCTOBER 1965

| School | Per cent of "Others" |
|---|---|
| A - M | 62 |
| B - M | 60 |
| C - X | 43 |
| D - X | 46 |
| E - X | 43 |
| F - X | 51 |
| G - X | 41 |
| H - K | 45 |
| I - K | 59 |
| J - K | 60 |
| K - K | 37 |
| L - K | 40 |
| M - Q | 56 |
| N - Q | 58 |
| O - Q | 41 |
| P - Q | 46 |
| Q - Q | 61 |
| R - Q | 43 |
| S - Q | 39 |
| T - Q | 52 |

## TABLE A3

## SAMPLE TRANSITIONAL JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS
## ETHNIC DATA, OCTOBER 1965

| School | Per Cent of "Others" |
|---|---|
| J-A-M | 42 |
| J-B-X | 40 |
| J-C-X | 50 |
| J-D-K | 59 |
| J-E-K | 73 |
| J-F-Q | 76 |

## TABLE A4

## TOTAL ADDITIONAL STAFF AND SERVICES: ELEMENTARY

| Schools | Sch. Secy | Asst to Prin | Guid. Couns | N.E. Coor. | Citiz. Class | Libr. | Aux. Tchr | Reduce Class Size | Jr. Guid | Corr. Read | Health Educ. | Art | Mus | Sci | Rd. Imp. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 79 | 50 | 7 | 30 | 1 | 14 | 10 | 4 | 93 | 15 | 78 | 36 | 27 | 40 | 34 | 16 |
| Per Cent of Total | 11 | 2 | 7 | - | 3 | 2 | 1 | 20 | 3 | 17 | 8 | 6 | 9 | 7 | 4 |

TOTAL ESEA POSITIONS: 455

## TABLE A5

## TOTAL ADDITIONAL STAFF AND SERVICES: JUNIOR HIGH

| Schools | School Secy. | Guidance Counselor | Demo. Teacher or Dept. Chairman | Lab Asst. | Library | Corr. Reading | Career Guid. | Class Size | Prep. Period |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 37 | 40 | 18 | 16 | 19 | 28 | 18 | 43 | 61 | 44 |
| Per Cent of Total | 14 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 6 | 15 | 21 | 15 |

TOTAL ESEA POSITIONS: 287

## TABLE A 6

## ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: SPECIAL CLASSES

| Activity | Positions Filled | Number of Schools | Number of Classes | Classes in Grades 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Creative Writing | | 1 | 3 | | 1 | 1 | 1 | | |
| Art | 6 | 8 | 132 | 9 | 20 | 26 | 34 | 33 | 19 |
| Music | 7.4 | 7 | 90 | 12 | 11 | 14 | 17 | 19 | 17 |
| Science Classes | 10 | 4 | 35 | | 6 | 8 | 7 | 10 | 4 |
| Mathematics | | 1 | 24 | | | 4 | 7 | 7 | 6 |
| Dance | | 1 | 18 | 1 | 8 | 8 | | 1 | |
| Remedial Reading | 18 | 9 | groups | 74 | 254 | (pupils)<br>226 | 185 | 141 | 120 |
| Language arts Coaching | | 2 | groups | 12 | 18 | 19 | 4 | | |
| Non-English | | 2 | 2 | 26 | in all grades | | | | |
| Science Club | | 1 | 1 | | | | 10 | 10 | |
| I.G.C. | | 1 | 3 | | | | 27 | 27 | 33 |

## TABLE A7

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS: SPECIAL CLASSES AND CLUBS

| Activity | Number of Schools | Grades (students involved) 7 | 8 | 9 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Creative Writing | 2 | 30 | 30 | 60 |
| Art | 1 | 30 | 30 | 30 |
| Music | 2 | 250 | 330 | 200 |
| Remedial Reading | 5 | 685 | 556 | 427 |
| Math Club | 1 | | | 18 |
| Human Relations Club | 1 | 20 | 19 | 21 |
| Future Teachers Club | 1 | | | 40 |

# TABLE A8

## ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS: LIBRARY CIRCULATION INCREASE

| Dewey Classification | Median Per cent Increase | No. of Schools Reporting |
|---|---|---|
| 000 General Works | 43 | 7 |
| 100 Philosophy | 17 | 7 |
| 200 Religion | 42 | 8 |
| 300 Social Sciences | 62 | 8 |
| 400 Linguistics | 69 | 8 |
| 500 Pure Science | 40 | 7 |
| 600 Applied Science | 35 | 7 |
| 700 Arts and Recreation | 38 | 7 |
| 800 Literature | 24 | 7 |
| 900 History | 41 | 7 |
| Total circulation increase: (includes fiction & biography) | 32 | 11 |

## TABLE A9

## JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOLS: LIBRARY CIRCULATION INCREASE

| Dewey Classification | Median Per cent Increase | No. of Schools Reporting |
|---|---|---|
| 000 General Works | 400 | 1 |
| 100 Philosophy | 300 | 3 |
| 200 Religion | 164 | 3 |
| 300 Social Sciences | 90 | 4 |
| 400 Linguistics | 20 | 3 |
| 500 Pure Science | 23 | 4 |
| 600 Applied Science | 37 | 4 |
| 700 Arts and Recreation | 76 | 4 |
| 800 Literature | 43 | 4 |
| 900 History | 70 | 4 |
| Total circulation increase: (includes fiction & biography) | 24 | 5 |

# Appendix B - INSTRUMENTS

## A SPECIAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM OF QUALITY INTEGRATED EDUCATION FOR SCHOOLS IN TRANSITIONAL AREAS

### List of Instruments

| | |
|---|---|
| Letter of Introduction | B1 |
| Principal Questionnaire, Elementary | B2 |
| Principal Questionnaire, Junior High | B16 |
| Teacher Questionnaire | B30 |

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
Educational Practices Division
33 West 42 Street
New York, N. Y.

February 15, 1967

TRANSITIONAL AREAS PROGRAM
TITLE I EVALUATIONS
EVALUATION RESEARCH DIRECTOR: Dr. Nathan Kravetz

Dear ____________________:

Under contract with the Board of Education, the CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION is undertaking at this time further, more intensive study of the E. and S. A. Title I activity, the Transitional Schools Program.

Dr. Donovan has given authorization for this work in General Circular No. 6, 1966-67, of the Board of Education.

Your school has been selected as one of a sample of Transitional Schools for this phase of the study. The research design includes a study of achievement of a sample of the pupils, analysis of additional personnel services assigned, a mobility study, review of ethnic variations, and other factors.

The enclosed questionnaire is one which I hope you will complete fully and return as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope.

Within a short time, you will be visited by research staff personnel who will collect sample data of achievement from pupil records. They will be working quickly and efficiently, and without any interference in the operations of the school.

Your cooperation is sincerely requested in order that this study may be conducted objectively and under the best possible conditions.

Yours truly,

Nathan Kravetz

Questionnaire (principal) Page 1

Principal, P. S.__________

Dear

Under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, your school was granted additional staff and services for the current 1966-67 academic year in order to enrich the educational program and thereby meet the individual needs of pupils in this transitional community. The number and types of additional staff members assigned to your school under the program are listed below.

Please indicate which of the additional positions you actually received as an official position allowance (Number Received), and those you were able to fill (Number Filled). In addition, for the filled positions, please include the license held and the years of experience under that license.

| Additional Staff | Number Assigned | Number Received | Number Filled | Date Filled | License Held | Years Experience |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Secretary | | | | | | |
| Asst. to Principal | | | | | | |
| Guidance Counselor | | | | | | |
| N. E. Coordinator | | | | | | |
| Citizenship Class Tea. | | | | | | |
| Librarian | | | | | | |
| Auxiliary Teacher | | | | | | |
| Reduce Class Size | | | | | | |
| Junior Guidance | | | | | | |
| Corrective Reading | | | | | | |
| Health Education | | | | | | |
| Art | | | | | | |
| Music | | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | | |
| Reading Improvement | | | | | | |

TOTAL POSITIONS

Questionnaire (principal) Page 2

GENERAL ACTIVITIES- (This section to be completed by Principal or Assistant)

1. If you did not receive all the positions, please indicate briefly why these positions were not filled. (If more space is needed, use back of page.)

2. For each of the filled positions describe the major activities being performed and the amount of time allotted to these services. Be sure to include the approximate numbers of pupils receiving these services and the grade levels of the pupils involved.

| Position | Major Activities | Hours per Week | Children served per grade | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| School Secretary | | | | | | | | |
| Assistant to Principal | | | | | | | | |
| Guidance Counselor | | | | | | | | |
| N. E. Coordinator | | | | | | | | |
| Citizenship Class Teacher | | | | | | | | |
| Librarian | | | | | | | | |
| Auxiliary Teacher | | | | | | | | |
| Reduce Class Size | | | | | | | | |
| Junior Guidance | | | | | | | | |
| Corrective Reading | | | | | | | | |
| Health Education | | | | | | | | |
| Art | | | | | | | | |
| Music | | | | | | | | |
| Science | | | | | | | | |
| Reading Improvement | | | | | | | | |

3. Which, if any, of the activities, programs and/or services described above represent innovations, initiated as a result of the transitional school?

Which of the programs and activities described in question 2 above were already in operation in the school, but were expanded as a result of the assignment of additional personnel? Please indicate the grades or pupils benefiting from the expansion of services.

4. Specifically, what advantages and benefits for children have accrued in the areas of art, health education, music and science as a result of the assignment of additional personnel under the transitional school program?

## Questionnaire (principal) Page 4

SPECIAL CLASSES AND CLUBS - (This section to be completed by the Principal or Assistant and the person primarily responsible for the special classes.)

1. Has the additional transitional area schools program staff facilitated the development of special classes or clubs for either the slow or gifted in such areas as creative writing, art, music, and remedial reading?
   Yes:________ No:________

   Please describe, including the number and kinds of special classes and the grade level. Be sure to indicate whether the class is for the slow or gifted.

   | | Children Served Per Grade | | | | | |
   |---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
   | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
   | Creative Writing | | | | | | |
   | Art | | | | | | |
   | Music | | | | | | |
   | Remedial Reading | | | | | | |
   | Other (specify) | | | | | | |
   | | | | | | | |
   | | | | | | | |

   Are these special classes held during the school day______?
   or after 3 p. m.?__________

2. Please describe any curricular adaptations in use in these special classes.

3. Please describe any evaluative procedures that have been used with the special classes.

Questionnaire (principal) Page 5

LIBRARY - (This section to be completed by the person in charge of the library.)

1. Does the librarian or teacher-specialist in charge of the library have a degree in Library Science?
   Yes:________ No:________

   What particular preparation has she had? Please specify number of hours, if any, of courses completed in library science.

2. What percentage of time does the librarian or teacher-specialist assigned to the library devote exclusively to library activities?

   ___________%

3. What were the circulation figures, by Dewey Classifications if possible, for the month of:

| | October 1965 | October 1966 |
|---|---|---|
| 000 | | |
| 100 | | |
| 200 | | |
| 300 | | |
| 400 | | |
| 500 | | |
| 600 | | |
| 700 | | |
| 800 | | |
| 900 | | |
| TOTAL | | |

LIBRARY - (Continued)

4. Will you please describe the effectiveness of the current library services for pupils as compared and contrasted with services to children during the previous year?

5. Can the changes in library services, if any, be attributed to the Transitional Areas Schools Program?

Questionnaire (principal) Page 7

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES - (This section to be completed by person in charge of Guidance and Counseling Services.)

1. Were the additional personnel assigned under the Transitional Areas Schools Program used to expand programs of individual counseling services previously in operation in the school?
   Yes:________ No:________

   If yes, describe these expanded programs of individual counseling services. Please include, by grade, the approximate number of pupils reached and any changes in frequency with which they are regularly seen.

2. Have the expanded individual counseling and guidance services resulted in changes in the type of counseling problems encountered?
   Yes: ________ No: ________

   If yes, please describe changes.

3. As compared with last year, were any new programs of individual counseling made possible as a result of the assignment of new personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program?
   Yes:________ No:________

   If yes, please describe the new services to individual pupils, specifying by grade, the number of new pupils reached. In addition, include any changes noted in the type of pupils' problems uncovered by the new services.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING - (Continued)

4. What percentage of the counselors' time is devoted to individual counseling and guidance?

   ____________%

5. As a result of the assignment of additional personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program, has there been any expansion of previously existing programs of group guidance services?

   Yes:__________ No:_________

   If yes, describe the expansions of group guidance services. Please include by grade, the numbers of groups of pupils seen and any changes in frequency with which groups meet on a regular basis.

6. Have the expanded group guidance services resulted in changes in the type of guidance problems encountered?

   Yes:________ No:________

   If yes, please specify.

7. As compared with last year, were any new programs of services to groups of pupils made possible as a result of the assignment of additional personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program?

   Yes:________ No:________

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES - (Continued)

If there have been newly developed programs of group guidance please specify the number of new groups seen and any changes in types of problems noted.
What grade levels are involved in the new program?

8. What percentage of the counselors' time is devoted to group guidance?

___________%

9. Please describe, for each grade K-6, any special guidance class made possible as a result of the new personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program.

Who is responsible for teaching these classes?

(please check)

Teachers_________ Counselors______________

OTP______________ Other (Please specify___

_________________________

10. Has the addition of transitional program guidance personnel resulted in increased contacts with teachers?
Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, please describe any changes this year in contacts between teachers and guidance personnel.

Questionnaire (principal) Page 10

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES - (Continued)

11. Has the addition of Transitional Areas Schools Program guidance personnel resulted in increased contacts with parents?

Yes:_________ No:__________

If yes, please describe the nature of this year's changes in contacts between parents and guidance personnel.

12. As a result of the assignment of guidance personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program, has there been any increase in contacts between guidance personnel in the school and out-of-school agencies and other counseling professionals?

Yes:_________ No:_________

If yes, please describe.

Questionnaire (principal) Page 11

PARENTS - (This section is to be completed by the Principal or Assistant.)

1. As compared with last year, have there been any changes in parents' attitudes toward the school that is reflected in their behavior?

   Yes:________ No:________

   Please describe these behavioral changes including such things as increased PTA participation, improved ease in obtaining volunteers, increased "positive communication," etc.

2. In your opinion can these changes be attributed to the Transitional Areas Schools Program?

   Yes:________ No:________

   If yes, please comment.

Questionnaire (principal) Page 12

GENERAL INFORMATION - (This section is to be completed by the Principal. If more space is required, please use back of page.)

By increasing the specialized services of schools in transitional neighborhoods it is hoped that the individual needs of pupils will be met, thus contributing to community stability. In your opinion, is the Transitional Areas Schools program an effective way of reducing the emigration of families from the neighborhood, and increasing community satisfaction with its schools?

1. In your opinion, why have families left this community?

2. What changes should be made to reduce the emigration of families from transitional neighborhoods?

3. Please list any other projects or programs in your school. Briefly describe the purposes of these programs.

4. Another part of the evaluation will be directed to the teachers in your school. For this reason, would you please list the names of all teachers who have been in this school for the entire period from September 1963 to the present?

| Name | Grade Taught |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

5. **We would welcome any additional suggestions or comments you would like to make. If you need more space, please use the back of the page. Thank you.**

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
Educational Practices Division
33 West 42 Street
New York, N. Y.

February 15, 1967

TRANSITIONAL AREAS PROGRAM
TITLE I EVALUATIONS
EVALUATION RESEARCH DIRECTOR: Dr. Nathan Kravetz

Dear ____________________:

Under contract with the Board of Education, the CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION is undertaking at this time further, more intensive study of the E. and S. A. Title I activity, the Transitional Schools Program.

Dr. Donovan has given authorization for this work in General Circular No. 6, 1966-67, of the Board of Education.

Your school has been selected as one of a sample of Transitional Schools for this phase of the study. The research design includes a study of achievement of a sample of the pupils, analysis of additional personnel services assigned, a mobility study, review of ethnic variations, and other factors.

The enclosed questionnaire is one which I hope you will complete fully and return as soon as possible in the enclosed envelope.

Within a short time, you will be visited by research staff personnel who will collect sample data of achievement from pupil records. They will be working quickly and efficiently, and without any interference in the operations of the school.

Your cooperation is sincerely requested in order that this study may be conducted objectively and under the best possible conditions.

Yours truly,

Nathan Kravetz

Junior High
Questionnaire (principal)
Page 1

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
Educational Practices Division
33 West 42 Street
New York, New York

Principal, J.H.S.__________

Dear

Under the provisions of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, Title I, your school was granted additional staff and services for the current 1966-67 academic year in order to enrich the educational program and thereby meet the individual needs of pupils in this transitional community. The number and types of additional staff members assigned to your school under the program are listed below.

Please indicate which of the additional positions you actually received as an official position allowance (Number Received), and those you were able to fill (Number Filled). In addition, for the filled positions, please include the license held and the years of experience under that license.

| Additional Staff | Number Assigned | Number Received | Number Filled | Date Filled | License Held | Years Experience |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| School Secretary | | | | | | |
| Guidance Counselor | | | | | | |
| Demonstration Teacher, or Department Chairman | | | | | | |
| Laboratory Assistant | | | | | | |
| Librarian | | | | | | |
| Corrective Reading | | | | | | |
| Career Guidance | | | | | | |
| Reduce Class Size | | | | | | |
| Preparation Period | | | | | | |

TOTAL
POSITIONS

Junior High
Questionnaire (principal) Page 2

GENERAL ACTIVITIES - (This section to be completed by Principal or Assistant.)

1. If you did not receive all the positions, please indicate briefly why these positions were not filled. (If more space is needed, use bottom of page.)

2. For each of the filled positions describe the major activities being performed and the amount of time alloted to these services. Be sure to include the approximate numbers of pupils receiving these services and the grade levels of the pupils involved.

| Position | Major Activities Performed | Hrs. per Week | Students served per grade | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | |
| School Secretary | | | | | | | | |
| Guidance Counselor | | | | | | | | |
| Demonstration Teacher, or Department Chairman | | | | | | | | |
| Laboratory Assistant | | | | | | | | |
| Librarian | | | | | | | | |
| Corrective Reading | | | | | | | | |
| Career Guidance | | | | | | | | |
| Reduce Class Size | | | | | | | | |
| Preparation Period | | | | | | | | |

3. Which, if any, of the activities, programs and/or services described above represent innovations, initiated as a result of the transitional school?

Which of the programs and activities described in question 2 above were already in operation in the school, but were expanded as a result of the assignment of additional personnel? Please indicate the grades or pupils benefiting from the expansion of services.

4. Specifically, what advantages and benefits for children have accrued in the areas of art, health education, music and science as a result of the assignment of additional personnel under the Transitional Schools Program?

Junior High
Questionnaire (principal) Page 4

SPECIAL CLASSES AND CLUBS - (This section to be completed by the Principal or assistant and the person primarily responsible for the special classes.)

1. Has the additional Transitional Area Schools Program staff facilitated the development of special classes or clubs for either the slow or gifted in such areas as creative writing, art, music, and remedial reading?

   Please describe, including the number and kinds of special classes and the grade level. Be sure to indicate whether the class is for the slow or gifted.

| | Children Served Per Grade | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 |
| Creative Writing | | | | | |
| Art | | | | | |
| Music | | | | | |
| Remedial Reading | | | | | |
| Other (specify | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

   Are these special classes held during the school day________? or after 3 p. m.?_______________

2. Please describe any curricular adaptations in use in these special classes.

3. Please describe any evaluative procedures that have been used with the special classes.

Junior High
Questionnaire (principal) Page 5

LIBRARY - (This section to be completed by the person in charge of the library.)

1. Does the librarian or teacher-specialist in charge of the library have a degree in Library Science?
   Yes:________ No:________

   What particular preparation has she had? Please specify number of hours, if any, of courses completed in library science.

2. What percentage of time does the librarian or teacher-specialist assigned to the library devote exclusively to library activities?

   ______________%

3. What were the circulation figures, by Dewey Classifications if possible, for the month of:

| October 1965 | October 1966 |
|---|---|
| 000 | |
| 100 | |
| 200 | |
| 300 | |
| 400 | |
| 500 | |
| 600 | |
| 700 | |
| 800 | |
| 900 | |
| TOTAL | |

LIBRARY - (Continued)

4. Will you please describe the effectiveness of the current library services for pupils as compared and contrasted with services to children during the previous year?

5. Can the changes in library services, if any, be attributed to the Transitional Areas Schools Program?

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES - (This section to be completed by person in charge of Guidance and Counseling Services.)

1. Were the additional personnel assigned under the Transitional Areas Schools Program used to expand programs of individual counseling services previously in operation in the school?
Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, describe these expanded programs of individual counseling services. Please include, by grade, the approximate number of pupils reached and any changes in frequency with which they are regularly seen.

2. Have the expanded individual counseling and guidance services resulted in changes in the type of counseling problems encountered?
Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, please describe changes.

3. As compared with last year, were any new programs of individual counseling made possible as a result of the assignment of new personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program?
Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, please describe the new services to individual pupils, specifying by grade, the number of new pupils reached. In addition, include any changes noted in the type of pupils' problems uncovered by the new services.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING - (Continued)

4. What percentage of the counselors' time is devoted to individual counseling and guidance?

____________%

5. As a result of the assignment of additional personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program, has there been any expansion of previously existing programs of group guidance services?

Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, describe the expansions of group guidance services. Please include by grade, the numbers of groups of pupils seen and any changes in frequency with which groups meet on a regular basis.

6. Have the expanded group guidance services resulted in changes in the type of guidance problems encountered?

Yes:________ No:________

If yes, please specify.

7. As compared with last year, were any new programs of services to groups of pupils made possible as a result of the assignment of additional personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program?

Yes:__________ No:__________

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES - (Continued)

If there have been newly developed programs of group guidance please specify the number of new groups seen and any changes in types of problems noted.
What grade levels are involved in the new program?

8. What percentage of the counselors' time is devoted to group guidance?

_________%

9. Please describe, for each grade K-6, any special guidance class made possible as a result of the new personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program.

Who is responsible for teaching these classes?

(please check)

Teachers__________ Counselors_______________

OTP_______________ Other (Please specify)____

___________________________

10. Has the addition of transitional program guidance personnel resulted in increased contacts with teachers?
Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, please describe any changes this year in contacts between teachers and guidance personnel.

GUIDANCE AND COUNSELING SERVICES - (Continued)

11. Has the addition of Transitional Areas Schools Program guidance personnel resulted in increased contacts with parents?

Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, please describe the nature of this year's changes in contacts between parents and guidance personnel.

12. As a result of the assignment of guidance personnel under the Transitional Areas Schools Program, has there been any increase in contacts between guidance personnel in the school and out-of-school agencies and other counseling professionals?

Yes:__________ No:__________

If yes, please describe.

Junior High
Questionnaire (principal) Page 11

PARENTS - (This section is to be completed by the Principal or Assistant.)

1. As compared with last year, have there been any changes in parents' attitudes toward the school that is reflected in their behavior?

   Yes:__________ No:__________

   Please describe these behavioral changes including such things as increased PTA participation, improved ease in obtaining volunteers, increased "positive communication," etc.

2. In your opinion can these changes be attributed to the Transitional Areas Schools Program?

   Yes:__________ No:__________

   If yes, please comment.

Junior High
Questionnaire (principal) Page 12

GENERAL INFORMATION - (This section is to be completed by the Principal. If more space is required, please use back of page.

> By increasing the specialized services of schools in transitional neighborhoods it is hoped that the individual needs of pupils will be met, thus contributing to community stability. In your opinion, is the Transitional Areas Schools Program an effective way of reducing the emigration of families from the neighborhood, and increasing community satisfaction with its schools?

1. In your opinion, why have families left this community?

2. What changes should be made to reduce the emigration of families from transitional neighborhoods?

3. Please list any other projects or programs in your school. Briefly describe the purposes of these programs.

4. Another part of the evaluation will be directed to the teachers in your school. For this reason, would you please list the names of all teachers who have been in this school for the entire period from September 1963 to the present?

| Name | Grade Taught |
|---|---|
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |

5. We would welcome any additional suggestions or comments you would like to make. If you need more space , please use the back of the page. Thank you.

CENTER FOR URBAN EDUCATION
33 West 42 Street
New York, N. Y. 10036

April 24, 1967

Transitional Schools Program
Title I Evaluation
Evaluation Project Director: Dr. Nathan Kravetz

Dear Teacher:

In September 1965, under the provisions of Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, your school was identified as a school in a transitional area and was granted additional staff and services in order to enrich the educational program, and thereby meet the individual needs of pupils in this transitional community.

This questionnaire is being sent to all teachers who have been in the transitional schools from September 1963 or longer. You have been selected as one of the teachers with four or more years experience in this school.

Since the Transitional Schools Program began in September 1965, you are in a unique position to make comparisons based on experiences before the start of this Program.

We would appreciate it if you would complete the questionnaire in detail and return it directly to us by May 15, 1967. Will you please use the individual stamped envelope provided? Your responses will be treated confidentially. We are asking your name in order to coordinate the data; however, no names will be mentioned in any report.

Your cooperation is sincerely requested in order that this study may be conducted objectively and under the best possible conditions.

Yours truly,

Nathan Kravetz

Questionnaire (teacher) Page 1

Name:________________________ School & Boro:__________ Title or Position:__________

1. During the current 1966-67 school year what is the nature of your assignment in this school?

grade level____________
approximate number of pupils____________
no. of pupils in each section (for JHS or IS)_________

If you have any assignment in addition to your primary responsibility indicated above, please describe it, specifying:
Nature of activity (clubs, centers, special remedial or tutorial work, etc.);
specific duties and approximate amount of time devoted to them;
number of pupils involved;
types or kinds of pupils involved.

Do these activities take place: during the school day or are they after school activities?

______________________________

2. Did the nature of your school responsibilities, assignments and activities change substantially when this school became a part of the Transitional Schools Program in September 1965?

No:_________ Yes:________ If yes, please describe the changes briefly.

Can you attribute these changes to the effects of the Transitional Schools Program?

No:_________ Yes:________ If yes, please specify how.

3. Is your current position one of the positions made possible through the school's participation in the Transitional Schools Program?

No:_________ Yes:________

Please comment.

Questionnaire (teacher) Page 2

4. Based on your experience in this school, has there been any notable increase in personnel resulting from the Transitional Schools Program?

No:________ Yes:________ Do not know:________

In what categories have you noted increases in personnel? Please specify.

5. What percentage of pupils in your class(es) are directly involved in the Transitional Schools Program either through direct contact with the special services and/or the specially assigned personnel? Be sure to approximate the percentage of pupils involved and the nature of their contacts with the Program.

6. In your opinion, has the assignment of additional personnel resulted in changes in services offered to pupils?

No:________ Yes:________ If yes, describe any change in services.

Are these new services, or services previously available but expanded as a result of the Program?

7. Have the added services and personnel of the Transitional Schools Program resulted in changes in the achievement of your pupils?

No:________ Yes:________

If no, please specify why not.

If yes, please indicate those subject areas of achievement that have been affected, and the nature of the changes in achievement.

Have there been any changes in pupil attitude toward school and education that might have resulted from the Transitional Schools Program?

No:________ Yes:________

If yes, please describe their changed attitudes.

Specify which particular aspects of the Program account for change in pupil attitude.

8. Based on your knowledge of this school, has there been any change in size of classes that may be due to the Transitional School Program?

No:________ Yes:________ Has class size tended to become smaller or larger?

Which aspects of the Transitional Schools Program are responsible for changes in class size?

9. As a result of the Program, have there been any changes in library services or use of the library?

No:________ Yes:________

Do the changes include:

Licensed librarians? No:________Yes:________

Improved library services? No:________ Yes:________

Increased available time in Library? No:____ Yes:____

Increased size of collections? No:______ Yes:_______

Increased circulation? No:________ Yes:________

Improved pupil attitude toward libraries and books? No:________ Yes:________

Other? Please describe.

10. Please describe any newly established special classes for gifted children due to the Transitional Schools Program. Indicate the kind of classes formed, the approximate number of children involved and their grade levels.

11. Please describe any special classes for remedial and/or tutorial services resulting from the Transitional Schools Program. Indicate the kind of classes, the number and grade levels of the pupils involved.

Are these classes on: School time?______ After School?_____

What has caused the formation of special classes or activities for the gifted or retarded pupil? (e.g., increased in remedial teachers, smaller classes, etc.)

12. How would you assess the effects of the Transitional Schools Program on the guidance services and activities offered to pupils in the school?
Please comment.

Has there been a noticeable increase in number of trained counselors?
No:________ Yes:________

Were there noticeable changes in individual guidance services?
No:________ Yes:________

Were there noticeable changes in group guidance activities?
No:________ Yes:________

Are more pupils now involved in the guidance program?
No:________ Yes:________

What new kinds of pupils or groups are now involved? Please specify.

Which additional grade levels are now being served? Please specify.

Have you observed any appreciable change in pupil attitude toward guidance services in this school?
No:________ Yes:________ Please describe the changes in attitude.

13. In your opinion, has the Transitional Schools Program had any impact on the parents and on the community?
No:________ Yes:________

If no, why not?

If yes, what changes in parent attitude or behavior have taken place as a result of the program?

If yes, please describe the aspects of the Program that have been most effective with parents and with the community.

Questionnaire (teacher) Page 5

14. This is a school in a changing, transitional neighborhood. One of the objectives of the Transitional Schools Program is to increase neighborhood stability. In your opinion, why are middle-class families leaving the neighborhood?

Do you think that the Transitional Schools Program, emphasizing increased services and additional personnel will be effective in stemming the tide of emigration?

15. How would you rate the general, over-all effectiveness of the Transitional Schools Program?

Has the main impact of the Program been accomplished through:

Improved Services? No:______ Yes:______

Increased Staff? No:______ Yes:______

Improved Faculty Morale and Motivation?
No:______ Yes:______

Other? Please describe.

16. Would you recommend that the Transitional Schools Program be:

Continued as is:________ Modified:______ Discontinued:_____

Why?

# APPENDIX C

## Staff List

Dr. Nathan Kravetz, Evaluation Chairman
Associate Professor of Education
Department of Education
Hunter College

Mrs. Barbara R. Heller, Lecturer
Office of Research and Evaluation
Division of Teacher Education
The City University of New York